REPORT RESUMES

ED 014 308 JC 670 967

JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS WHO WERE INITIATED INTO PHI THETA KAPPA FOR SELECTED YEARS DURING THE PERIOD 1947-1965.

BY- SCHULTZ, RAYMOND E. GARRETT, LOUIS W.

PUB DATE AUG 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$6.04 149P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *HONOR SOCIETIES, STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS, *FOLLOWUP STUDIES, *ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, *CAREER CHOICE, CAREERS, QUESTIONNAIRES, SUPERIOR STUDENTS, ABLE STUDENTS,

A QUESTIONNAIRE WAS SENT TO SELECTED ALUMNI AND CURRENT MEMBERS OF PHI THETA KAPPA TO DETERMINE (1) PRE-COLLEGE BACKGROUND, (2) JUNIOR COLLEGE ACTIVITIES, (3) TRANSFER SUCCESS, (4) OPINIONS ON JUNIOR COLLEGE, (5) COMPARISON OF JUNIOR AND SENIOR COLLEGES, (6) HONORS AND ACTIVITIES IN SENIOR COLLEGE, (7) UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE MAJORS, (8) POST-GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES, AND (9) POST-GRADUATE COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES. THE CONCLUSIONS DRAWN FROM THE REPLIES ARE THAT (1) PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES ARE PROVIDING A GOOD EDUCATION FOR THE ACADEMICALLY TALENTED, (2) THIS SUPERIORITY CONTINUES IN TO SENIOR COLLEGE, IN BOTH STUDY AND EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES, (3) THESE HONOR STUDENTS CONSIDER THEIR JUNIOR AND SENIOR COLLEGE TEACHING GENERALLY EQUAL IN QUALITY, (4) THE FRATERNITY PERFORMS A SIGNIFICANT EDUCATIONAL SERVICE BY INSPIRING AND REWARDING EXCELLENCE, (5) THE MEN TRANSFERS TEND TO SELECT SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING MAJORS, AND (6) THE HIGH PERCENTAGE OF BOTH MEN AND WOMEN WHO ENTER EDUCATION ARE LIKELY PROSPECTS FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE TEACHING. THE AUTHORS SUGGEST FURTHER RESEARCH ON (1) POSSIBLE DIFFERENCES IN PERSONALITY OR VALUES BETWEEN HONOR-STUDENT MEMBERS AND NON-MEMBERS OF PHI THETA KAPPA, (2) PARALLEL STUDIES OF JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS AND GIFTED FIRST- AND SECOND-YEAR SENIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS, AND (3) THE POSSIBLE VALUE JUDGMENTS INFLUENCING SO MANY TO CHOOSE SCIENCE CAREERS. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 20 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ERIC

ED014308

JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS WHO WERE INITIATED INTO PHI THETA KAPPA FOR SELECTED YEARS DURING THE PERIOD 1947 - 1965

Raymond E. Schultz
Florida University
Tallahassee, Florida

Louis W. Garrett
Florida College
Temple Terrace, Florida

August 1967

JC 670 967

JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS WHO WERE INITIATED INTO PHI THETA KAPPA FOR SELECTED YEARS DURING THE PERIOD 1947-1965

Raymond E. Schultz
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

Louis W. Garrett
Florida College
Temple Terrace, Florida

August 1967

PREFACE

Accompanying the growth which junior colleges are experiencing in America is an increase in systematic investigation of various aspects of this type of institution. The study with which this report is concerned provides evidence on one aspect of the overall role of the junior college in the American educational system; namely, its contribution to students of exceptional academic ability.

The cooperation of a great many individuals made this study possible. Notable among these were the faculty sponsors and student members of participating Phi Theta Kappa chapters. They secured the address of alumni Phi Theta Kappa members, mailed the questionnaires to them, filled out questionnaires themselves--in the case of students--and returned the completed questionnaires to national headquarters. The 1965 national student officers and faculty advisory committee provided valuable assistance in formulating the study. Throughout, Mrs. Margaret Mosal, Executive Director for the fraternity, gave unselfishly of her time and talent.

Credit is also due the Florida State University Computing Center with support from the National Science Foundation. Grant GP-5114 to the University from NSF made possible the analysis of the mass of data which were gathered. Mr. Clarence Roberts, a graduate student, gave freely of his time in processing the data in the Computing Center. His wife, Hilda, proved to be a master at coding questionnaires for the transmitting of data to punch cards.

Louis W. Garrett Raymond E. Schultz

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE ii

LIST OF TABLES. v

Chapter

I. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY. 1

Purpose of the Study
Definition of Terms
Background and Need for the Study
Review of Related Literature
Scope of the Study
Description of the Study
Procedures of the Study
Presentation of the Data

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS 28

Distribution by Age
Distribution by Sex
Marital Status
Socio-economic Background
Educational Attainment
Size of Families
Reasons for Attending a Junior College
Student Employment
Summary

III. THE COLLEGE EXPERIENCE OF PHI THETA KAPPA MEMBERS. 64

Amount of Formal Education
Reasons Given for not Graduating from the Junior College
Reasons for Transferring from the Junior College
Consideration on Transferring Again
Reasons Given for Not Graduating from Senior College

Chapter Page

Academic Honors
Leadership Experience
Counseling and Guidance
Comparison of Teaching
Comparison of Class Work
Grade Point Average
Graduation Schedule
Evaluation of the Junior College
Summary

IV. AN EVALUATION OF THE PHI THETA KAPPA FRATERNITY BY CURRENT AND ALUMNI MEMBERS 94

Views on Phi Theta Kappa Membership
Evluation of Phi Theta Kappa Activities
Improving Phi Theta Kappa
Phi Theta Kappa Conventions
Summary

V. ACTIVITIES OF HONOR STUDENTS AFTER COLLEGE. . . 106

Educational Advancement
Occupations Following Graduation
Political, Civic and Community Activities
Summary

VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . 125

Summary

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Distribution of Chapters and Population by State 22

2. Age Distribution of Entering Junior College Honor Students. 30

3. Distribution of Junior College Honor Students by Sex, Year and Type of Institutions 31

4. Marital Status of Entering Junior College Honor Students. 32

5. Occupational Levels of the Head of the Family for Public and Private Junior College Honor Students. 34

6. Occupational Levels of the Head of the Family in High, Medium, and Low Rankings 38

7. Occupational Status of the Mothers of Junior College Honor Students. 40

8. Occupational Level of Employed Mothers of Junior College Honor Students 41

9. Comparison of the Status of Mothers of Honor Students in Public and Private Junior Colleges. 43

10. Occupational Level of Employed Mothers of Honor Students in Public and Private Junior Colleges 45

11. Educational Attainment of Head of Family for Public and Private Junior College Honor Students. 47

12. A Comparison of the Educational Attainments of Fathers of Entering Freshmen of Sixty-four Universities and Those of Junior College Honor Students as Reported by the American Council on Education. 50

Table Page

13. Educational Attainment of the Mother of Public and Private Junior College Honor Students 51

14. A Comparison of the Educational Attainments of Mothers of Entering Freshmen of Sixty-Four Universities as Reported by The American Council on Education and Those of Junior College Honor Students 53

15. Number of Children in the Family of Public and Private Junior College Honor Students. . . . 55

16. Reasons Given by Junior College Honor Students for Attending Public and Private Junior Colleges 57

17. Amount of Outside Employment per Week for Public and Private Junior College Honor Students 60

18. Junior College Credits Obtained by Honor Student Alumni 66

19. Distribution of Junior College Honor Students Who Transferred to Senior College. 67

20. Highest Degree Received by Junior College Honor Students Compared by Year and Sex. . . 68

21. Reasons for Honor Students' Not Completing the Junior College Program 69

22. Reasons Honor Students Transferred from Junior College before Graduation. 71

23. Responses by Honor Students to the Question about Their Transferring Again 72

24. Reasons Given by Junior College Honor Students for Not Graduating from Senior College . . . 73

25. Junior College Honor Students' Academic Recognition in Senior College 75

26. Elected Offices Held by Junior College Honor Students in Senior Institutions. 76

Table Page

27. Extra-Curricular Activities Participated in by Junior College Honor Students in Senior Institutions 77

28. Ratings of the Junior College Counseling and Guidance Programs by Junior College Honor Students 78

29. Ratings of the Senior College Counseling and Guidance Programs by Junior College Honor Students 78

30. Comparison by Junior College Honor Students of Junior and Senior College Counseling and Guidance Services. 80

31. Comparison by Junior College Honor Students of Junior College Teaching with Senior College Teaching 81

32. Comparison by the Junior College "Best" Instructor and the Senior College "Best" Instructor 82

33. Comparison by Junior College Honor Students of Difficulty of College Work in Junior and Senior Colleges. 83

34. Change in Overall Grade Average of Junior College Honor Students after First Year Transfer to Senior Colleges. 85

35. Graduation Schedule of Junior College Honor Students after Transfer to Senior Institutions 86

36. Consideration by Junior College Honor Students As to Whether a Student of High Ability Can Get As Good Education the First Two Years in a Junior College As in a Senior College. . . 89

37. Response As To Whether Honor Students Would again Attend Junior College. 90

38. Consideration by Junior College Honor Students As To Whether They Will Send Their Children to a Junior College. 91

Table | Page

39. Consideration by Current and Alumni Phi Theta Kappa Members As To Whether They Would Recommend Membership to Others 96

40. Values of Phi Theta Kappa Membership to Current and Alumni Members 97

41. Importance of Membership in Phi Theta Kappa to Current and Alumni Members 98

42. Evaluation of Activities of Local Chapters of Phi Theta Kappa by Current and Alumni Members. 99

43. Rating of Most Rewarding Activities of Phi Theta Kappa by Current and Alumni Members. . 100

44. Rating of Least Valuable Activities of Phi Theta Kappa by Current and Alumni Members. . 101

45. Suggestions by Current and Alumni Members for Improving Phi Theta Kappa. 103

46. Evaluation of State and Regional Conventions by Current and Alumni Members. 104

47. Evaluation of the National Conventions of Phi Theta Kappa by Current and Alumni Members. . 105

48. Undergraduate Majors of Junior College Honor Students 109

49. Graduate Majors of Junior College Honor Students 111

50. Most Recent Occupations of Former Junior College Honor Students 116

51. Voting Record of Former Junior College Honor Students 119

52. Participation of Former Junior College Honor Students 119

53. Participation by Former Junior College Honor Students in Civic Affairs. 120

Table Page

54. Participation by Former Junior College Honor Students in Religious Affairs 121

55. Participation by Former Junior College Honor Students in Educational Activities. 122

56. Ratings by Former Junior College Honor Students of Participation in Community Activities. 123

57. Number of Professional and Business Organizations in Which Former Junior College Honor Students Hold Membership. 124

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this investigation is to study the current and alumni membership of Phi Theta Kappa, the national junior college honor fraternity, as a special segment of the junior college population. Attention will be directed toward their socio-economic backgrounds, their activities and academic preparation in the junior college; their transfer success; their reactions to the junior college; their comparison of junior and senior college experiences; their activities in the senior institution; their acceptance of community responsibilities subsequent to their educational preparation; and their professional activities after leaving college.

More specifically, this investigation undertakes to answer the following questions about current and alumni Phi Theta Kappa members:

1. What are their personal backgrounds?
2. What Phi Theta Kappa-related activities do they rank as most and least important?

3. What is their evaluation of certain aspects of the junior college program? For example, what is their evaluation of the instruction they received in the junior college, the competence of their instructors, and their counseling and guidance programs?
4. What is the success and fields of study of those who transfer to senior college?
5. How do alumni members who transfer view their preparedness to pursue their education in senior colleges?
6. What subsequent honors do alumni members receive and in what activities do they participate after transfer to senior colleges?
7. What success do they have in their chosen profession?
8. How well do alumni members accept community responsibilities after finishing their education? For example, do they participate in civic, political, educational, religious, and professional activities?

Definition of Terms

Phi Theta Kappa.--A junior college honor fraternity that is officially sanctioned by the American Association of Junior Colleges. The Phi Theta Kappa constitution states: "To be eligible for membership in Phi Theta Kappa, a student shall be regularly enrolled as a freshman in a junior college, shall be carrying a regular full-time load (as defined by his institution) and shall have completed at least one term in the college division."[1] In addition, a student is required to maintain "a grade point ratio of not less than a 2, which is a B."[2]

Alumni Members.--As the term is used here, it refers to former active Phi Theta Kappa members who terminated their active membership in good standing.

Honor Students.--As this term is used in this study it refers to those junior college honor students who were members of Phi Theta Kappa.

Background and Need for the Study

A major role of junior colleges in America is that of preparing capable students to transfer to senior institutions from which they expect to receive baccalaureate degrees. Conflicting reports have been given about the quality of work done in the junior colleges and the qualifications of those who complete a two-year program to continue their work elsewhere. Recently, Knoell and Medsker[1] completed a study which indicated that still further attention should be given to the problem.

---

[1] The Constitution and By-Laws of Phi Theta Kappa, Revised 1954.

[2] *Ibid*.

Knoell[2] studied 7,200 students from more than 300 two-year colleges who transferred to senior colleges. Her major objectives were to "find out how successful the junior college students were in achieving their goals; how they compared with senior college students with respect to ability, grades and time needed to earn their degrees; what effect institutional factors had on the success of students; what kind of transfer policies, practices, programs, and machinery for articulation and coordination were operating during the period of the study."[3]

She found that: (1) fewer than half the junior college transfer students graduated on time, (2) almost 1/3 dropped out before the end of the study, and (3) the "differential for the entire group between cumulative junior college average and the average for the first semester after transfer was only - 0.3 but the differential for the five types of colleges ranged from 0.0 for teacher's colleges to - 0.5 for major state universities."[1]

---

[1] Dorothy M. Knoell and Leland L. Medsker, Factors Affecting Performance of Transfer Students from Two- to Four-Year Colleges: With Implications for Coordination and Articulation (Berkeley: University of California, 1964).

[2] Dorothy M. Knoell, "Focus on the Transfer Program," The Junior College Journal, Vol. 35 (1965), p. 5.

[3] Ibid.

Medsker's study[2] in 1956 included a cross-section of the junior college population from 243 institutions in 15 states. He investigated such matters as students' ability, socio-economic background, age range, marital status, the ratio of men to women, and reasons for attending and withdrawing from junior college. He concluded that, in general, their socio-economic backgrounds were somewhat lower than those of senior college students and their mental ability was slightly inferior, though some of the students were just as capable as the ones in senior college.

Tillery[3] in a more recent study compared junior college students and university students on intellective and non-intellective factors, socio-economic background, and student attitudes in relation to their choice of senior institution. His study of junior college students who were eligible to enter the University of California and a sample of University freshmen concluded that the junior college students were less well-prepared academically, less mature socially, and less intellectually motivated than the freshmen who enrolled initially in the university.

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 7.

[2] Leland L. Medsker, _The Junior College: Progress and Prospect_ (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960).

[3] Harry Dale Tillery, "Differential Characteristics of Entering Freshmen at the University of California and Their Peers at California Junior Colleges" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of California, Berkeley, California, 1964).

Medsker and Trent[1] in a study published in November, 1965 investigated the influence of different types of public higher institutions on college attendance from varying socio-economic and ability levels. This report, containing a sample of 10,000 graduates from 37 high schools in 16 communities located in 9 states, concentrated on the graduates during their first year of high school. Among their findings were these: (1) "the effect of the junior college is most noticeable among those graduates of high ability but low socio-economic level,"[2] (2) "the occupation of the father has considerable influence not merely upon whether his child will go to college, but upon the type of college he will attend,"[3] and "the majority of students who enter the latter type of college, whether these be state-supported four-year institutions or public junior colleges, are from less advantaged homes."[4]

Using these four investigations as a frame of reference within which to describe a new junior college population, the writer studied junior college honor students who are members of Phi Theta Kappa and made comparisons and contrasts with the findings of the other investigations. Phi Theta Kappa was selected for this investigation because it is officially sanctioned and approved by the American Association of Junior Colleges as a junior college honor fraternity. These honor students could help to answer certain questions about the fraternity and the junior colleges. For example: Were these honor students delayed in their graduation? Did they experience a drop in their grade point average comparable to that which was discovered by the Knoell study? Did they fit into the pattern of student characteristics which the Knoell study discovered? Did these students consider their association with an organization that had as its primary function the encouragement of academic excellence of any particular value? How well were junior colleges preparing their best students, who were members of Phi Theta Kappa, to meet the challenges of the senior colleges and universities?

---

[1] Leland L. Medsker and James W. Trent, _The Influence of Different Types of Public Higher Institutions on College Attendance from Varying Socio-economic and Ability Levels_ (Berkeley: University of California, 1965).

[2] _Ibid_., p. 69.

[3] _Ibid_., p. 73.

[4] _Ibid_., p. 102.

It has been claimed that the best teaching is being done in the junior college. Affirming that superior instruction is characteristic of the junior college, James W. Reynolds, Professor and Consultant in Junior College Education from the University of Texas, said:

> You know, as I know, that this recognition is accorded because superior instruction is one of, if not the most valuable product we have to give this nation.

> While superior instruction as the unfailing hallmark of junior colleges has been important in the past, its importance is even greater in the immediate present.[1]

Is the general acceptance of the proposition that "superior instruction is the unfailing hallmark of the junior college" justified?

Review of Related Literature

An examination of the literature reveals that great interest has been aroused in the role and the place of the junior college in American higher education. Books and articles have been written on many phases of the junior college, and investigations have searched the souls of these institutions to know them intimately. A primary concern has been with the quality of the student and of the work being done. For the most part, these investigations have been involved with the general population of the junior college with only a few singling out the best students for study. In reviewing the literature only those materials that are pertinent to matters proposed for investigation in this study are reviewed.

One of the earliest works on the junior college is The Junior College Movement[2] by Leonard V. Koos. Koos concerned himself with every facet of the junior college and concluded that junior college students compared favorably with those in the senior institutions.

---

[1] Improvement of Instruction, Unpublished Proceedings of the Fourth Junior College Administrative Teams Institute, July 27-31, 1964, at Pensacola, Florida, p. 2.

[2] Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College Movement (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota, 1924).

Walter Crosby Eells likewise addressed himself to the problem of the success of the junior college transfers who entered colleges and universities. In his book The Junior College[1] published in 1931, Eells stated that the success of the preparatory function of junior colleges is summed up in this question: "Does his work stand up in comparison with that of students who have had their previous training at the university?"[2] To answer this question, Eells called upon the evidence of the past investigations conducted between 1920 and 1930. He stated that in some cases the studies were detailed and excellent, but in others the investigations and conclusions were rather vague and general.

Eells' own study in California in 1928 dealt with three distinct types of junior college transfers: (1) "independent junior colleges, organized in separate junior college districts, (2) junior college departments of high schools, and (3) junior college departments connected with six of the state teachers' colleges." He concluded that there were "no significant differences . . . found between the different types of junior colleges, but very significant differences . . . found between the junior college students as a whole and the two groups used for comparison."[1] The summary conclusion of the whole matter was: "The groups of junior college transfers, both men and women, showed marked superiority over corresponding groups of native Stanford students, and slight superiority over the upper division students transferring from standard four-year colleges."[2]

---

[1] Walter Crosby Eells, The Junior College (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1931).

[2] Ibid., p. 254.

[3] Ibid., p. 257.

Eells also computed the academic accomplishments of each junior college transfer for each quarter of residence at Stanford University. He concluded: "The junior college men, while starting lower than . . . the native Stanford men, [rise] steadily and constantly, showing distinct and constantly increasing superiority of accomplishment for the junior college group."[3] The differences for the women, in the group he studied, were not so pronounced but were somewhat similar to those of the men.

With reference to junior college transfers in graduate work, Eells stated: "Apparently the chance of securing students for the graduate division from among junior college transfers is almost twice as great as the chance of securing graduate students from among those who were admitted to the university as freshmen."[4]

In summarizing the studies in the decade before the publishing of his book, Eells stated: "on the whole they show marked success for the junior college in the exercise of the preparatory function."[1] He found only two exceptions to his general conclusions about the success of junior college transfers and these were in the University of Texas and the University of California.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., pp. 259-260.

[4] Ibid., p. 262.

The studies of Showman[2] and Ruch, Baker, and Ryce,[3] dating from 1929, concluded that senior college students performed better than the junior college students in the university programs. D. D. Grossman[4] stated that junior college transfers did at least as well academically in latter years at the institutions of higher learning as did the native students. Eells[5] reported in 1943 that even terminal students (who had not originally planned to transfer) were doing well in senior institutions.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 274.

[2] H. M. Showman, "Junior College Transfers at the University of California at Los Angeles," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, Vol. 4 (1929), pp. 319-322.

[3] G. M. Ruch, D. C. Baker, and E. Ryce, "A Comparison of the Scholarship Records of Junior College Transfers and Native Students of the University of California," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, Vol. 4 (1929), pp. 201-213.

[4] D. D. Grossman, "Junior College Transfers at Illinois," Junior College Journal, Vol. 4 (1934), pp. 297-303.

[5] Walter Crosby Eells, "Success of Transferring Graduates of Junior College Terminal Curricula," American Association of Collegiate Registrars Journal, Vol. 18 (1943), pp. 372-398.

Jesse P. Bogue[1] stated in 1950 that many studies had been made as to the success of junior college students in senior institutions, and that "in general, right across the nation, the success of junior-college graduates is no longer open to question."[2] He quoted from Eells' study to prove that even the terminal students who had transferred were doing well. Bogue also quotes from the work of Ruth E. Maguire[3] in the spring of 1948 saying:

> The most interesting aspect of Miss Maguire's study relates to the success of the terminal student who had entered the university. She shows that the student from the junior-college terminal or semiprofessional curricula 'achieves as well, or better, academically than the student prepared in the general academic curriculum.'[4]

The works of C. H. Siemens[5] in 1943 and H. P. Rodes[6] in 1949 concurred. In 1954, the same findings were reported after a thorough examination by Martorana and Williams.[7]

---

[1] Jesse P. Bogue, The Community College (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950), pp. 73-74.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ruth E. Maguire, "A Descriptive Study of 430 Junior College Students Transferring to Syracuse University from 1937 to 1946 Inclusive," (unpublished Master's thesis, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, 1948).

[4] Bogue, op. cit., p. 74.

[5] C. H. Siemens, "Predicting Success of Junior College Transfers," Junior College Journal, Vol. 14 (1943), pp. 24-26.

[6] H. P. Rodes, "Successful Transfer in Engineering," Junior College Journal, Vol. 20 (1949), pp. 121-127.

[7] S. V. Martorana and L. L. Williams, "Academic Success of Junior College Transfers at the State College of Washington," Junior College Journal, Vol. 24 (1954), pp. 402-415.

However, within the last few years dissenting voices again have been heard. Knoell[1] and Tillery[2] concluded that junior college students were not of the caliber first reported and were not doing so well academically. Tillery considered that the junior college students were not so mature in many ways as were their counterparts in the university.

Hillway[3] rather superficially compared the two-year and the four-year students, giving his suppositions as to why certain students may have selected the junior college. Thornton[4] likewise gave attention to the students in the junior college with special attention to their abilities, sex, age, marital status, outside employment, and other similar characteristics.

Medsker,[5] in the spring of 1956, sent questionnaires to 342 junior colleges in 15 states to obtain data on the junior colleges. Of this number 243 responded, and he followed his gathering of material with a personal visit of one or two days to each institution. His comprehensive work gives an excellent insight into the students of junior colleges as well as other very important information about junior colleges in general. Clark[1] in the same year (1960) published his case study of the San Jose Junior College. This controversial work set the stage for further investigation into the socio-economic background, abilities, and characteristics of junior college students. Knoell and Medsker's important study[2] brought to light much valuable information about the factors affecting the performance of transfer students from two-year to four-year colleges and universities. In 1965, Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson[3] published their study of the junior college with particular emphasis upon the social forces that brought the junior college into existence. At the same time, they covered much of the same material about the junior college student that had been written before.

---

[1] Knoell, op. cit., p. 6.

[2] Tillery, op. cit.

[3] Tyrus Hillway, The American Two-Year College (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958).

[4] James W. Thornton, Jr., The Community Junior College (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1960).

[5] Medsker, op. cit.

In summary, a review of the literature reveals that little or no study has been done on the junior college honor student per se, but continuing research of the junior college students generally is now being conducted but still more is needed. The majority of the research has centered on a comparison of the junior college student with his senior college counterpart or with junior college students in general. Information about junior college honor students is simply an addition, hopefully of meritorious value, to this growing body of knowledge.

---

[1] Burton R. Clark, The Open Door College: A Case Study (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962).

[2] Knoell and Medsker, op. cit.

[3] Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965).

Background of Phi Theta Kappa

This study is concerned with an important segment of the junior college population, those students who excell academically in their junior college studies. Students of top ability are entering junior colleges in ever-increasing numbers; however, they are being joined by many students of less capability. Junior colleges, therefore, have the responsibility of providing differentiated educational experiences to meet the needs of all levels of students. They must provide for students who for academic reasons would not be admitted to many institutions of higher education. At the same time they must meet the intellectual demands of students who could perform well in any academic environment. The "ability spectrum" in a typical junior college is wide indeed.

Phi Theta Kappa is a scholastic honorary which ferrets out excellent students and awards their excellence by membership in an organization encouraging honor and quality. Article I, section 2, of the Phi Theta Kappa constitution states: "The purpose of the society shall be to promote scholarship, to develop character, and to cultivate fellowship among the students of both sexes of the junior colleges of the United States of America."[1]

There was a conscious effort in the naming of the junior college honor fraternity to establish a connection, at least mentally, with the older and more widely known senior college counterpart Phi Beta Kappa.[2] As Ruth Barnard states in her article on Phi Theta Kappa, published in 1932:

> In choosing a name, the committee was influenced by the fact that the name of the honorary society for senior colleges is Phi Beta Kappa. Accordingly, the name Phi Theta Kappa was chosen and the society was incorporated in Missouri as a national organization.[3]

Stephens College, which has gained much recognition through the years for providing leadership and vision to the junior college movement, was the first school to call together other groups for the purpose of organizing a society which would recognize junior college scholarship. There were six charter members of the precursor of Phi Theta Kappa, which was first called Kappa Phi Omicron. Under the leadership of Mrs. Elizabeth Moore, then dean of women at Stephens, the first group was organized in 1910. In 1911 the Beta chapter was established at Lindenwood College in St. Charles, Missouri. Many other similar societies were developing around the country and a concerted effort was soon to be made to bring all of these groups together into one organization.

---

[1] An unpublished proposed revised Constitution of the Phi Theta Kappa Fraternity.

[2] No organic connection exists between Phi Beta Kappa and Phi Theta Kappa.

[3] Ruth Barnard, "Phi Theta Kappa," Junior College Journal, Vol. 2 (February, 1932), pp. 258-262.

Initially the fraternity had chapters only in women's junior colleges. It was understood in the early days of the movement that similar organizations might exist on other two year college campuses, and if these organizations, even though they did not adopt the name Phi Theta Kappa, wished to become a part of the national organization, they were at liberty to do so. In 1918, the presidents of the women's junior colleges met and decided that the name Phi Theta Kappa should be universally used and a national organization should be developed. A drive was then conducted to induce other colleges and honor groups to join them in the formation of a nationwide Phi Theta Kappa. The only condition was that they meet and maintain the standard of scholarship stipulated by the Phi Theta Kappa constitution. In 1924, a constitutional amendment provided that men's junior colleges and coeducational junior colleges could join the new movement.

Eight women's colleges made up the first Phi Theta Kappa organization and all eight of these junior colleges were in Missouri. These were:

Alpha	Hardin College, Mexico, Missouri
Beta	Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri
Gamma	Christian College, Columbia, Missouri
Epsilon . . .	Cottey College, Nevada, Missouri
Zeta	Lindenwood College, St. Charles, Missouri

Eta . . . . . William Woods College, Fulton, Missouri
Theta . . . . Central College, Lexington, Missouri[1]

The growth of the fraternity was very slow at first with only fourteen chapters in existence in 1928. The fraternity needed official recognition before it could experience nation-wide growth. This "was given Phi Theta Kappa by the American Association of Junior Colleges at the 1929 meeting, held November 18 and 19 at Atlantic City, New Jersey."[2]

Phi Theta Kappa Fraternity in 1965 had 248 chapters in the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone. This represents a very substantial rate of growth, and new chapters are still being established at a rapid rate. Within the ten-year period from 1955 to 1965, 116 chapters were added.[3] The constitution provides for new chapters to be made and added to the list by complying with the constitutional provision, section I, Article VI:

> Active chapters may be established at any junior college which offers two years of college work equivalent to freshman and sophomore years of a fully accredited four-year college or university; provided that the college applying is a member of the American Association of Junior Colleges and of a regional accrediting agency or fulfills the requirements of the Executive Committee.[4]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 258.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 260.

[3] James W. Reynolds, "Report of Phi Theta Kappa Study 1964-65," (unpublished study of Phi Theta Kappa, 1965, Austin, Texas).

[4] Constitution, p. 12.

Membership in Phi Theta Kappa is limited to full-time students who meet the standards of Article VII of the Revised Constitution, adopted in 1954. The provision for membership has remained the same through the years. Moreover, the revised constitution defines a full-time student as one who is carrying 12 or more credit hours of work in a junior college. Article VIII, section 2, B, states:

> To be eligible for active membership, a student must possess the following qualifications:
>
> (1) He must be of good moral character and possess recognized qualities of citizenship as judged by the faculty.
>
> (2) At the time of election he must be within the upper scholastic ten percent of the regularly enrolled student body of the college division. Eligibility shall be based on the average of all college work in the college division previous to election.[1]

In summary, Phi Theta Kappa has been recognizing and promoting scholarship by students for nearly fifty years and is enjoying an increasing scope of influence.

Description of the Study

Population

The population of this study consists of 2,758 alumni who were initiated into Phi Theta Kappa during the academic years 1947-48, 1957-58, and 1960-61 and 1,413 current junior college students who were initiated in the fall of 1965. The time period represented by these four groups was eighteen years. During that time there had been important changes in higher education, including junior colleges, and, possibly, Phi Theta Kappa.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

The 1965 group, designated current members, was selected in order that a recent sample might be drawn to compare with those of earlier years. The information obtained from this group was less extensive than that which was received from the earlier groups because it was still enrolled in junior colleges when the data were collected. Information for members of this group was obtained on their background, their reasons for attending the junior colleges, their work in Phi Theta Kappa, and their reaction to the junior college of the present time.

Alumni members of 1960-61 had in nearly all cases completed their studies in the junior college and most had transferred to a senior institution for further study. It was expected that a considerable number of this group were still engaged in graduate study. Alumni members of 1957-58 constituted a group that had had time to complete their formal education, establish themselves in careers, and assume community responsibilities. Alumni members of 1947-48 represented a group that had had opportunity to make marked advancement in their chosen careers and community leadership roles. Further they reflected the thinking of a different generation from the current-member group. Also they could supply information about the junior college and Phi Theta Kappa fraternity of an earlier period. Data from these three alumni groups were obtained relative to their work in the junior college and the fraternity and their transfer to a higher educational institution.

Of the 248 chapters of Phi Theta Kappa functioning as of May 1965, 133 (54 percent) agreed to participate in the study. One hundred twelve of these carried through on their commitment providing information on 4,171 current and alumni members. Those 112 chapters are located in 29 different states and Washington, D.C.[1] The distribution of these chapters and the population by state are shown in Table 1.

This population represents a sample of over 95 percent of the current members and 66.4 percent of the alumni Phi Theta Kappa members (of participating institutions) for the years covered by the study. The percentage for alumni members was computed by eliminating those questionnaires which were returned because of inadequate addresses. Returns from individual junior colleges ranged from 48 to 100 percent.

An analysis was made to determine if a bias might have occurred in alumni responses for institutions where return percentages were low. The analysis consisted of selecting the institutions from which returns were lowest--ranging from 48 to 59 percent--and matching them (in terms of type of institution, size, and geographic location) with

---

[1] Of the three California chapters none elected to participate in this study. A state honor society serves most of the California junior colleges.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION BY STATE OF CHAPTERS AND POPULATION INCLUDED IN STUDY

State	Chapters	Alumni Members	Current Students	Total
Alabama	2	29	21	50
Colorado	3	124	46	170
Connecticut	1	29	10	39
Delaware	1	17	5	22
District of Columbia	2	0	10	10
Florida	10	20	178	198
Georgia	3	78	165	143
Idaho	1	41	8	49
Illinois	7	268	149	417
Kansas	2	73	5	78
Kentucky	2	0	19	19
Massachusetts	3	106	25	131
Michigan	3	13	41	54
Minnesota	2	94	27	121
Mississippi	8	219	103	322
Missouri	8	360	65	425
Nebraska	3	62	28	90
New Hampshire	1	37	6	43
New Jersey	1	57	11	68
New York	5	24	90	114
North Carolina	9	124	87	211
Ohio	1	9	7	16
Oklahoma	4	81	46	127
Pennsylvania	2	17	40	57
Tennessee	1	8	21	29
Texas	18	675	237	912
Utah	1	0	7	7
Virginia	4	97	21	118
Washington	2	12	18	30
Wyoming	2	84	17	101
Totals	112	2,758	1,413	4,171

institutions from which returns were high--ranging from 80 to 100 percent. The average return for the "low return" institutions was 54.4 percent compared to 86.1 percent for the "high return" institutions. Comparisons were made of the responses by the two groups for items of the questionnaire on which it was expected biases would appear if they existed. In no instance was there more than a nominal difference in the responses between the "high return" and the "low return" groups. This supports the view that no biases existed in the questionnaire responses from institutions where the percentages of returns were low.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made relative to the material of this study:

1. The information provided by the current and alumni members of Phi Theta Kappa was accurate.

2. Those providing information are representative of the total population in each group.

3. Junior college honor students who are members of Phi Theta Kappa are representative of junior college academic honor students generally.

4. The selection of the years 1965, 1960-61, 1957-58, 1947-48 provides a cross-section picture of Phi Theta Kappa membership for the period 1947 to 1966.

5. The 112 chapters participating in this study are representative of the 248 chapters of Phi Theta Kappa which existed in October, 1965.

Limitations

This study is limited to the limitation encountered by use of a questionnaire as the source of information.

Procedures of the Study

The national officers of Phi Theta Kappa with Mrs. Margaret Mosal, the national Executive Director of the honor fraternity, and a representative of the faculty sponsors of the organization met in a special called meeting in the summer of 1965 on the campus of Florida State University. Dr. Raymond E. Schultz of Florida State University and the writer met with the group and presented the ideas for the study to be undertaken as a project for the entire Phi Theta Kappa organization. Plans and procedures for the study were subsequently drawn up and presented to the group for its official approval.

Step I. In September of 1965 letters were prepared and sent from the national headquarters of Phi Theta Kappa at Canton, Mississippi. These letters invited each chapter to participate in the study. The letter explained the project briefly and emphasized the benefits that would accrue to the participating chapters and institutions. It was sent to the president and the chapter sponsor of each junior college in the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone in which there was a chapter of Phi Theta Kappa.

Step II. In November, 1965 two preliminary questionnaire forms were prepared, one for current members of the fraternity and another for the three groups of alumni members. These questionnaires were first submitted to a seminar group in higher education at Florida State University, consisting of approximately sixteen graduate students and six professors of higher education. After this refining process, the questionnaires were sent to thirty Phi Theta Kappa sponsors for their criticisms and evaluation. Following this procedure, a final form of both questionnaires was prepared.[1]

Step III. In January, 1966 copies of these questionnaires along with instructions were sent to national headquarters of Phi Theta Kappa for distribution to the participating chapters.

---

[1] Appendices A and B contain Current and Alumni Questionnaires.

The Executive Director sent these materials to the sponsors of each participating chapter along with the names of alumni members to be contacted. Suggestions were provided to the chapters on how to locate the address of alumni members.

Step IV. In February and March, 1966 the questionnaires were sent to the individuals who were to complete them. Participating chapters were instructed to make follow-ups of individuals not returning the form within a specific time.

Step V. In March, April, and May, 1966 participating chapters returned the completed forms to the Executive Director along with the names which she had provided. A cut-off date of June 20 was established for returning completed questionnaires.

Step VI. During the period April-June, 1966 questionnaires were coded and the information was transferred to punched cards.

Step VII. From June through September, 1966 printouts of the data were obtained from the Florida State University Computing Center.

Step VIII. During the period from October, 1966 to April, 1967 the data were studied and analyzed.

Presentation of the Data

The data collected and analyzed for this study are presented as follows: (1) Chapter I contains the background of the study with a review of the literature. (2) Chapter II contains the characteristics of junior college honor students who are Phi Theta Kappa members. (3) Chapter III contains an analysis of the college experiences of Phi Theta Kappa members. (4) Chapter IV contains an evaluation of Phi Theta Kappa by current and alumni members. (5) Chapter V reports the activities of Phi Theta Kappa members after leaving junior college. (6) Chapter VI presents a summary of the findings followed by conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

CHARACTERISTICS OF JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS

Concerning the characteristics of college students Max Wise stated:

> A broader knowledge of college students is needed for fuller understanding and more effective teaching. This deeper understanding of students can be gained by exploring their backgrounds. Their homes, their age, ability, sex, race, religion--all these are significant.[1]

This chapter reports the background characteristics of former junior college honor students who were initiated into chapters of the Phi Theta Kappa Fraternity in private and public junior colleges of the United States during the years selected for this study. All characteristics reported are in terms of when these former students entered junior college. They are: (1) age, (2) sex, (3) marital status, (4) reasons for entering the junior college, (5) socio-economic backgrounds, (6) educational background of the parents, and (7) number of brothers and sisters. Where possible, the findings were related to those of other studies of junior college students. Also, comparisons were made where relevant between honor students in private and public junior colleges. Medsker notes that "one might expect that the selective private junior college and the non-selective public junior college would have different student bodies."[1]

---

[1] W. Max Wise, They Came For The Best of Reasons--College Students Today (Washington: American Council on Education, 1958), p. 3.

The number of respondents for each group varies slightly in the tables throughout this work because of omissions of some items on the questionnaires. Percentages for each table are computed in terms of response for the item covered in the table.

Distribution by Age

Table 2 presents the distribution by age of entering junior college honor students included in the study compared by year and alumni versus current members. It can be seen by examination of the table that over three-fourths (76.6 percent) of these students were 18 years of age or younger at the time of entering college. On the other hand, 13.0 percent of them were 20 years of age or older which means that they were as old or older than typical juniors and seniors in four-year institutions. There appear to be no consistent trends in the age of entering junior college honor students over the period covered by this study.

---

[1] Medsker, op. cit., p. 29.

TABLE 2

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF ENTERING JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS

	Alumni Groups			Total Alumni	Current Students	Total Group
Age	(1947-48) N=406 %	(1957-58) N=1013 %	(1960-61) N=1339 %	N=2758 %	(1965-66) N=1413 %	N=4171 %
16	2.9	5.1	2.1	3.7	1.1	2.9
17	23.3	28.6	19.6	23.5	14.6	21.2
18	43.9	41.3	56.3	47.8	64.2	52.5
19	10.7	11.7	11.2	11.3	10.2	10.9
20	5.8	3.0	2.3	3.3	2.1	2.9
21-23	6.3	5.1	4.7	5.2	4.5	4.9
24-26	5.8	2.1	2.0	2.8	0.9	2.3
27-over	4.2	2.9	1.8	2.7	3.5	2.9

Distribution by Sex

Over 60 percent of these junior college honor students were women. In private junior colleges the percentage was even higher.

Although there was a high percentage of women honor students in the public junior colleges, it was approximately 20 percent lower than in the private junior colleges. This can be accounted for by the fact that 15 of the 39 private colleges in this study were women's colleges.

Enrollment figures compiled by the United States Office of Education show that 59.7 percent of the 1961 degree-credit students enrolling in the junior college for the first

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS BY SEX, YEAR, AND TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Year	Public			Private			Total Group		
	No.	Male %	Female %	No.	Male %	Female %	No.	Male %	Female %
1947-48	323	39.9	60.1	83	24.1	75.9	406	36.7	63.1
1957-58	652	42.0	58.0	361	20.0	80.0	1013	34.2	65.8
1960-61	839	48.5	51.5	500	20.6	79.4	1339	38.1	61.9
Total Alumni	1814	44.7	55.3	944	21.3	78.7	2758	36.7	63.3
Current Students	1030	38.8	60.9	383	26.9	73.9	1413	35.4	64.6
Total Group	2844	42.3	57.6	1327	22.9	77.1	4171	36.1	63.8

time were male and 40.3 percent were female.[1] Wise notes in a study he made of senior college students that "except for that youngest group, men outnumber women at every age level in college."[2] Medsker found that in the 75 two-year colleges which cooperated in the overall study of the 1952 entering class, the ratio of men to women was three to one.[3] By contrast, of the public junior college honor students in this study 42.3 percent were men and 57.6 percent were women. It is apparent that the proportion of junior college women who were academic honor students exceeds greatly their representation in the population of coeducational junior colleges.

---

[1] A Fact Book on Higher Education, Prepared by the Office of Statistical Information and Research of the American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.

[2] Wise, *op. cit*., p. 9.

[3] Medsker, *op. cit*., p. 45.

Marital Status

Table 4 shows that 93.1 percent of these entering junior college honor students were single. Further, it will be noted that the differences among the various time periods used for this study are so small as to be inconsequential. In view of the fact that a substantial proportion of the group was over 20 years old when entering junior college, one might have expected more of them to be married.

TABLE 4

MARITAL STATUS OF ENTERINE JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS

Marital Status	Alumni Groups (1947-48) N=404	Alumni Groups (1957-58) N=1012	Alumni Groups (1960-61) N=1328	Total Alumni N=2744	Current Students N=1406	Total Group N=4150[a]
Married	6.7	8.1	6.1	7.0	5.8	6.4
Single	92.7	90.8	93.6	92.4	93.8	93.1
Divorced, Separated or Widowed	0.4	0.9	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.5

[a] Excludes 21 who did not provide this information.

Medsker found that 23 percent of the junior college students included in his study were married.[1] He further implies that earlier studies, if available, might show even a greater percentage of married students.[2] It must be remembered, however, that Medsker's findings were based on students at varying stages in their junior college program and not on their marital condition at the time of entering the junior college as was the case for this study. Therefore, a direct comparison cannot be made.

Socio-Economic Background

Table 5 shows that less than one-fourth (21.8 percent) of these honor students classified the occupation of the head of their household as professional or semi-professional. For those attending public junior colleges the percentage was only 16.2. As might be expected, the socio-economic backgrounds of private junior college honor students were considerably higher than were those of the public junior college students, with nearly one-third (31.6 percent) classifying the occupation of the head of their family at the time of entering junior college as professional or semi-professional. By contrast, nearly 60 percent of the total group classified the occupation of the head of their family in occupations which reflect middle and lower socio-economic

---

[1] _Ibid_.

[2] _Ibid_.

TABLE 5

OCCUPATIONAL LEVELS OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS[a]

	Alumni Groups			Total Alumni	Current Students	Total Group
	(1947-48)	(1957-58)	(1960-61)			
Public Private Total Group	N=318 N= 82 N=400	N=644 N=355 N=999	N=821 N=494 N=1315	N=1783 N= 931 N=2714	N=1021 N= 380 N=1401	N=2804 N=1311 N=4115[b]
	%	%	%	%	%	%
I. Professional, and semi-professional						
Public	15.7	16.8	15.3	16.3	16.9	16.2
Private	23.2	35.2	35.4	31.7	31.8	31.6
Total Group	17.3	23.3	22.9	22.2	21.0	21.8
II. Proprietors, managers, officials, etc.						
Public	21.4	14.3	19.4	18.7	18.6	18.3
Private	18.3	27.9	25.7	23.8	15.8	22.1
Total Group	20.8	19.2	21.7	20.7	18.1	19.8
III. Craftsmen, foremen, kindred workers						
Public	20.8	24.5	21.9	21.9	22.7	22.3
Private	25.6	15.5	13.2	17.8	17.4	17.6
Total Group	21.8	21.3	18.6	20.1	21.3	20.5
IV. Operatives and kindred workers						
Public	12.9	14.0	10.6	12.5	12.6	12.7
Private	6.1	5.4	5.5	5.8	9.5	6.5
Total Group	11.5	10.9	8.7	9.9	11.8	10.5

V. Clerical, sales, and kindred workers						
Public	9.7	10.4	11.2	10.8	10.1	10.5
Private	7.3	7.9	9.1	8.4	10.3	9.0
Total Group	9.3	9.5	10.4	9.9	10.1	9.9
VI. Protective services						
Public	3.1	2.3	2.3	2.7	3.4	2.8
Private	9.8	0.8	1.4	3.1	2.9	3.4
Total Group	4.5	1.8	2.0	2.3	3.3	2.6
VII. Service workers except domestic & protective						
Public	1.9	1.1	2.3	1.7	2.6	1.9
Private	1.2	0.8	0.4	0.9	1.6	1.1
Total Group	1.8	1.0	1.6	1.4	2.4	1.7
VIII. Farmers and farm managers						
Public	12.9	14.3	14.6	13.1	10.0	12.9
Private	7.3	4.8	8.1	6.8	8.4	7.0
Total Group	11.8	10.9	12.2	11.6	9.6	10.9
IX. Domestic services						
Public	0.6	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.4
Private	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
Total Group	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.3
X. Unemployed and pension						
Public	0.9	2.0	2.2	1.0	2.4	1.7
Private	1.2	1.4	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.2
Total Group	0.9	2.0	2.2	1.9	2.4	1.7

---

[a] The occupational classification system is an adaptation of the system used by the United States Bureau of Census.

[b] Excludes 56 who did not provide this information.

levels. For those attending public junior colleges the percentage was 65.5. (This includes those in occupational classification III and lower.)

There seem to be no trends of change among the various time periods included in this study. By virtue of the general trend toward a larger proportion of the working force in the upper level occupations, it might be expected that this trend would be reflected here.

Medsker quotes Darley's study[1] in 1959 of Minnesota entering college students who were classified according to the father's occupation saying that "only 29 percent of the students entering Minnesota junior colleges came from a high (professional and semi-professional) occupational level."[2] This percent is considerably above the 16.2 percent of the public junior college honor students in this study who came from a high occupational level but about the same as the 31.6 percent for the private junior college honor students.

Medsker and Trent[3] reported that in private two-year colleges 21 percent of the fathers were in professional and semi-professional occupations and in the public two-year colleges 18 percent were in the same category. Although the percentages for public junior college honor students in this study were approximately the same as theirs, the proportion of the heads of families of private junior college honor students in the top occupational classification were higher than in their study. Also, Medsker and Trent reported that in the private two-year colleges, 23 percent were small business owners as compared to 14 percent for the public. While precisely that category was not used in this study, 18.3 percent of the public junior college and 22.1 percent of the private junior college honor students were from an occupational background of proprietors, managers, officials, and the like.

---

[1] John G. Darley, "Factors Associated with College Careers in Minnesota" (unpublished manuscript, Center for the study of Higher Education, Berkeley, California, 1959), table 4.

[2] Medsker, op. cit., p. 41.

[3] Medsker and Trent, op. cit., p. 73.

Medsker and Trent used a socio-economic classification system of "high," "medium," and "low" based on the occupational level of the head of the household. Table 6 represents a reclassification of the data presented in Table 5 into high, medium, and low occupational classification. An effort was made to make these classifications as comparable as possible to those used by Medsker and Trent. The high includes the professional and semi-professional level shown in Table 5. The medium category includes levels II and III of Table 5. The low category comprises the remaining seven occupational levels of Table 5. Twenty-one and eight-tenths percent were in the high occupational level; 40.3 percent were in the medium; and 37.8 percent were in the low.

TABLE 6

OCCUPATIONAL LEVELS OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY IN HIGH, MEDIUM, AND LOW RANKINGS

		Alumni Groups			Total Alumni	Current Students	Total Group
		(1947-48)	(1957-58)	(1960-61)			
Public		N=318	N=644	N= 821	N=1783	N=1021	N=2804
Private		N= 82	N=355	N= 494	N= 931	N= 380	N=1311
Total Group		N=400	N=999	N=1315	N=2714	N=1400	N=4115[a]
		%	%	%	%	%	%
High							
	Public	15.7	16.8	15.3	16.3	16.9	16.2
	Private	23.2	35.2	35.4	31.7	31.8	31.6
	Total Group	17.3	23.3	22.9	22.8	21.0	21.8
Medium							
	Public	42.2	38.8	41.3	40.6	41.3	40.6
	Private	43.9	43.4	38.9	41.6	33.2	39.7
	Total Group	42.6	40.5	40.3	40.8	39.4	40.3
Low							
	Public	42.1	44.4	43.4	43.0	41.8	42.9
	Private	32.9	21.4	25.7	26.4	35.0	28.3
	Total Group	40.1	36.2	36.8	37.0	39.6	37.8

[a] Excludes 56 who did not provide this information.

Slightly more than one-third of the mothers of these honor students were employed outside of the home. In 8.2 percent of the cases the mother was the head of the household and for 27.6 percent of the families, though not the head of the household, the mothers were employed. Table 7 reports these data.

The largest group of working mothers was employed in clerical, sales, and kindred work (43.2 percent for the total group); another 28.5 percent were employed in professional and semi-professional occupations. The next largest group, 11.1 percent, was employed in service work other than domestic and protective service. The remainder were distributed among the other categories as shown by Table 8.

A comparison of the occupational status of the mothers of public and private junior college honor students shows some variations, as Table 9 indicates. The three alumni groups differed little in the status of the mothers of public and private junior college honor students although the mothers of public junior college honor students are employed slightly more frequently. However, of the current group, a great many more mothers of the public junior college honor students (44.1 percent) than the mothers of private junior college honor students (12.3 percent) were employed. Further, in virtually all cases where the mothers of private junior college honor students were employed, they were heads of the household.

TABLE 7

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF THE MOTHERS OF JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS

Status	Alumni Groups			Total Alumni	Current Students	Total Group
	(1947-48)	(1957-58)	(1960-61)		(1965-66)	
	N=275 %	N=699 %	N=925 %	N=1899 %	N=910 %	N=2809[a] %
Mothers not employed	63.6	63.4	65.2	63.9	64.5	64.2
Mothers employed (not head of family)	28.7	28.9	27.4	28.0	25.7	27.6
Mothers employed and head of family	7.7	7.7	7.4	8.1	9.7	8.2

[a] Excludes 1,352 who did not respond to this item.

TABLE 8

OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL OF EMPLOYED MOTHERS OF JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS[a]

	Alumni Groups			Total Alumni	Current Students	Total Group
	(1947-48) N=110 %	(1957-58) N=265 %	(1960-61) N=348 %	N=723 %	N=416 %	N=1139 %
Professional and semi-professional	30.0	30.2	21.6	28.4	22.1	28.5
Proprietors, managers, officials	11.8	9.1	6.3	8.7	5.3	7.6
Craftsmen, foremen, kindred workers	1.8	5.7	4.6	4.4	3.4	3.9
Operatives and kindred workers	2.7	3.8	2.9	3.5	5.5	3.8
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	40.0	38.1	41.1	40.9	51.2	43.2
Protective service workers	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.1	0.0	0.1
Service workers not domestic and protective	11.8	11.7	10.9	11.6	10.8	11.1

Farmers and farm managers	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1
Domestic service workers	1.8	1.5	1.7	1.7	1.2	1.5
Unemployed persons and pensioners	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1

---

[a] The occupational classification system is an adaptation of the system used by the United States Bureau of Census.

TABLE 9

COMPARISON OF THE STATUS OF MOTHERS OF HONOR STUDENTS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

	Alumni Groups			Total Alumni	Current Students	Total Group
	(1947-48)	(1957-58)	(1960-61)		(1965-66)	
Public	N=220	N=432	N=282	N=934	N=665	N=1599
Private	N= 55	N=266	N=343	N=664	N=216	N= 880
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Mothers not employed						
Public	61.3	59.2	61.4	60.6	55.8	59.4
Private	56.6	65.8	63.0	62.8	87.7	68.3
Mothers employed (not head of family)						
Public	31.9	33.7	30.6	31.3	35.4	32.9
Private	33.7	26.1	31.4	29.6	0.4	22.9
Mothers employed and head of family						
Public	6.8	7.1	8.0	8.1	8.7	7.5
Private	9.6	8.1	5.6	7.6	11.9	8.8

Table 10 shows that although more mothers of public junior college honor students were employed outside of the home, of those who are employed, the proportions in various occupations are very similar for the two groups. To illustrate, 73.5 percent of the employed mothers of private junior college honor students were in the professional and semi-professional level or in clerical, sales, and kindred work and 70.6 percent of the employed mothers of public junior college honor students were in the same groupings.

Educational Attainment

More than three-fifths of the junior college honor students were the first of their families to continue their formal education beyond high school. Table 11 shows that 63.1 percent of the heads of the families had a high school education or less. Another 12.8 percent entered but did not complete a two-year college program. Only 7.3 percent were from homes in which the head of the family had a graduate or professional degree.

A comparison of the educational attainments of the heads of the families of public and private junior college honor students shows that approximately 10 percent more of the public institution honor students were from homes in which the head of the family had no more than a high school education. Eighty-three and six-tenths percent of them were from homes in which the family head had no more than two years of college. This compared to 73.4 percent for the heads of families of

TABLE 10

OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL OF EMPLOYED MOTHERS OF HONOR STUDENTS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES[a]

	Alumni Groups			Total Alumni	Current Students	Total Group
	(1947-48)	(1957-58)	(1960-61)		(1965-66)	
Public	N=85	N=178	N=211	N=474	N=304	N=778
Private	N=25	N= 87	N=137	N=249	N=112	N=361
	%	%	%	%	%	%
I. Professional, and semi-professional						
Public	25.8	32.0	30.3	29.0	20.4	27.2
Private	44.0	26.4	33.6	32.8	26.7	31.6
II. Proprietors, managers, officials						
Public	14.1	6.2	5.2	7.7	4.9	7.2
Private	4.0	14.8	8.0	9.2	6.2	8.6
III. Craftsmen, foremen, etc.						
Public	2.4	5.1	2.8	3.5	3.9	3.8
Private	0.0	6.9	7.3	4.2	1.7	4.0
IV. Operatives, etc.						
Public	3.5	2.2	2.8	2.8	5.6	3.4
Private	0.0	6.9	2.9	3.9	5.3	4.2

V. Clerical, sales, etc.						
Public	37.6	37.6	44.0	41.6	52.6	43.4
Private	48.0	39.1	36.5	40.5	46.3	41.9
VI. Protective services						
Public	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.1
Private	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.8	0.0	0.4
VII. Services except domestic, protective						
Public	14.6	14.6	11.3	12.8	10.8	12.4
Private	4.0	5.7	10.2	8.3	10.7	8.7
VIII. Farm and farm managers						
Public	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.2
IX. Domestic services						
Public	2.4	2.2	2.8	2.5	3.0	2.6
Private	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.2
X. Unemployed persons, pensioners						
Public	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

---

[a] The occupational classification system is an adaptation of the system used by the United States Bureau of Census.

TABLE 11

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF HEAD OF FAMILY FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS

	Alumni Groups			Total Alumni	Current Students	Total Group
	(1947-48)	(1957-58)	(1960-61)			
Public Private Total Group	N=320 N= 82 N=402 %	N=647 N=357 N=1005 %	N=830 N=417 N=1324 %	N=1797 N= 856 N=2731 %	N=1021 N= 379 N=1400 %	N=2818 N=1235 N=4131[a] %
Elementary school or less						
Public	26.0	29.0	23.5	24.0	16.4	21.5
Private	21.7	19.7	17.6	18.8	16.4	18.1
Total Group	25.1	25.7	21.3	22.1	16.4	21.5
Some high school						
Public	14.2	19.2	21.5	18.3	16.0	18.1
Private	12.0	13.3	13.8	13.3	14.4	13.3
Total Group	13.8	17.1	18.6	17.0	15.6	16.8
High school graduate						
Public	22.6	21.0	25.1	24.1	33.2	25.9
Private	26.5	21.1	23.0	22.7	23.0	23.1
Total Group	23.4	21.1	24.3	23.9	30.4	25.1
CUMULATIVE TOTAL	62.3	63.9	66.2	63.0	62.4	63.4
Public	62.8	69.2	70.1	65.5	65.6	65.5
Private	60.2	54.7	54.4	54.8	53.8	54.5

Some college						
Public	14.9	11.1	11.7	12.7	12.1	12.6
Private	15.7	12.5	14.6	13.9	13.6	13.8
Total Group	15.4	11.7	12.8	13.2	12.5	12.8
Finished two-year program						
Public	6.8	4.1	5.3	5.6	6.0	5.8
Private	7.0	4.7	4.8	4.9	5.2	5.1
Total Group	6.7	4.3	4.9	5.6	5.8	5.3
CUMULATIVE TOTAL	84.04	79.9	81.9	81.8	80.7	81.5
Public	84.5	84.4	86.7	86.0	83.7	83.6
Private	82.9	71.9	73.8	74.0	71.6	73.4
Four-year college degree						
Public	5.3	4.3	4.5	4.9	6.2	5.6
Private	9.6	9.2	10.0	9.6	8.9	9.4
Total Group	6.2	6.4	6.6	6.4	6.9	6.5
No degree beyond bachelor's[b]						
Public	2.2	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.3	3.5
Private	3.6	7.8	5.4	6.5	9.4	7.6
Total Group	2.5	5.0	4.3	4.5	5.0	4.6
Graduate or professional degree						
Public	7.1	7.4	5.0	6.9	6.8	6.9
Private	3.6	10.8	10.6	9.9	9.1	9.7
Total Group	6.4	8.6	7.1	7.2	7.4	7.3

---

[a] Excludes 40 who did not provide this information.

[b] Those represented in this category undertook study beyond the baccalaureate but did not obtain another degree.

private junior college honor students. Twenty-six percent (26.0%) of the private junior college honor students were from homes in which the head of the family had at least a college degree as compared to 15.4 percent for those of public junior college honor students.

The results of the American Council on Education Survey of Entering Freshmen Characteristics, Fall 1966[1] (as reported in a memorandum to the faculty and professional staff of Florida State University) indicate that for the 64 universities included in the study, 7.2 percent of the fathers of these entering college freshmen had no more than an elementary school education and that 47.5 percent of them had not continued beyond high school. By contrast, 63.1 percent of the heads of the families of junior college honor students had not continued their formal education beyond high school. The educational attainments of the family heads of entering university students was consistently higher than those of these junior college honor students. Table 12, containing the findings of the survey of the American Council on Education, presents this contrast.

The mothers of junior college honor students were more often high school graduates than were the heads of the households. The percentages run slightly higher for the mothers

---

[1] "American Council on Education Survey of Entering Freshmen Characteristics, Fall 1966" (unpublished study by Alexander W. Astin, Office of Research of the American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1967).

TABLE 12

A COMPARISON OF THE EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENTS OF FATHERS OF ENTERING FRESHMEN OF SIXTY-FOUR UNIVERSITIES AS REPORTED BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION AND THOSE OF JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS

Educational Attainment	University[a] %	Junior College[b] %
Elementary school or less	7.2	21.5
Some high school	12.9	16.8
High school graduate	27.4	25.1
Some college	20.0	18.1
College degree	20.3	11.1
Postgraduate degree	12.2	7.3

[a] Data for this column taken from the American Council on Education Survey of Entering Freshmen Characteristics, Fall 1966.

[b] These data refer to the head of the household of students included in this study.

in all categories except graduate or professional degrees. Table 13 presents the educational attainment of the mothers.

Mothers of honor students in private junior colleges had higher educational attainments than did mothers of public junior college honor students. It can be seen from Table 13 that 27.3 percent of the mothers of private junior college honor students had completed at least a two-year college program and that 16.8 percent had graduated from a senior college. By contrast, 19.3 percent of the mothers of public junior college honor students had completed at least a two-year program and 11.2 percent had graduated from a senior institution. Both groups were approximately equal in obtaining graduate and professional degrees.

TABLE 13

EDUCATION ATTAINMENT OF THE MOTHERS OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS[a]

	Alumni Groups			Total Alumni	Current Students	Total Group
	(1947-48)	(1957-58)	(1960-61)		(1965-66)	
Public	N=290	N=593	N= 754	N=1637	N= 784	N=2421
Private	N= 74	N=331	N= 466	N= 871	N= 283	N=1154
Total Group	N=364	N=924	N=1220	N=2508	N=1067	N=3575
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Elementary school or less						
Public	14.5	18.2	17.2	17.1	11.2	15.2
Private	17.6	11.8	12.0	12.9	11.7	12.6
Total Group	15.1	15.9	15.2	15.5	11.3	14.2
Some high school						
Public	14.8	21.2	18.0	18.6	16.1	17.5
Private	17.6	12.1	11.6	13.0	13.1	13.0
Total Group	15.4	18.1	15.6	16.8	15.3	16.0
High school graduate						
Public	39.3	30.2	33.6	33.5	41.6	36.2
Private	31.1	32.4	35.6	33.4	34.3	33.6
Total Group	37.6	31.0	34.3	33.2	39.6	35.6
CUMULATIVE TOTAL	68.1	65.0	65.1	65.5	66.2	65.8
Public	68.6	69.6	68.8	69.2	68.9	68.9
Private	66.3	56.3	59.2	59.3	59.1	59.3

Some college						
Public	9.0	12.0	12.2	11.5	11.9	11.8
Private	8.1	14.2	13.7	11.3	14.5	14.0
Total Group	8.8	12.8	12.8	11.2	12.6	11.8
Finished two-year program						
Public	10.3	5.7	7.6	7.4	8.7	8.1
Private	14.9	11.5	8.4	10.2	9.9	9.9
Total Group	11.3	7.8	7.9	8.5	9.0	9.0
CUMULATIVE TOTAL	88.2	85.6	85.8	85.2	87.8	85.2
Public	88.9	87.3	88.6	88.1	89.5	88.8
Private	89.3	82.0	81.3	82.8	83.5	83.2
Four-year college degree						
Public	4.8	6.7	5.8	6.0	5.4	5.7
Private	6.8	10.9	10.5	10.1	10.2	10.1
Total Group	5.2	8.2	7.6	7.4	6.7	6.9
Work beyond bachelor degree						
Public	4.5	2.9	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.5
Private	2.7	4.8	5.4	4.9	4.2	4.7
Total Group	4.1	3.6	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.9
Graduate or professional degree						
Public	2.8	3.0	2.0	2.5	1.5	2.0
Private	1.4	2.1	2.8	2.1	2.8	2.1
Total Group	2.5	2.7	2.3	2.6	1.7	2.3

---

[a] Excluding mothers who were heads of households.

The educational attainments of mothers of entering university students, as surveyed by the American Council on Education,[1] are consistently higher than those of the mothers of junior college honor students. For example, only 4.5 percent of the mothers of the university students had obtained no more than an elementary school education as compared to 14.2 percent of the mothers of junior college honor students who had obtained no more than the elementary education. Table 14 shows this consistent pattern throughout.

TABLE 14

A COMPARISON OF THE EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF MOTHERS OF ENTERING FRESHMEN OF SIXTY-FOUR UNIVERSITIES AS REPORTED BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION AND THOSE OF JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS

Educational Attainment	University[a] %	Junior College[b] %
Elementary school or less	4.5	14.2
Some high school	11.0	16.0
High school graduate	41.9	35.6
Some college	22.1	20.8
College degree	17.4	10.8
Postgraduate degree	3.2	2.3

[a] Data for this column taken from the American Council on Education Survey of Entering Freshmen Characteristics, Fall 1966.

[b] These data refer to the mothers of students included in this study.

---

[1] *Ibid.*

Size of Families

The size of the family from which junior college honor students come does not appear to have changed appreciably over the last two decades. Over 10 percent are only children in the family, but 54.9 percent are from families with three or more children. Over 8 percent (8.7%), were from large families of six or more children. An examination of Table 15 also reveals that the families of public junior college honor students tend to be somewhat larger than the families of private junior college honor students. For example, 9.9 percent of the families of public junior college honor students have six or more children as compared to 6.7 percent for the honor students of private junior colleges.

Reasons for Attending a Junior College

Table 16 shows that 45.3 percent of the public junior college honor students ranked as first their reason for attending a junior college nearness to their homes, and 29.5 percent ranked low cost first. Substantial differences were found in the reasons given for attending a private junior college. Thirty percent (30.0%) ranked as first their reason for attending a private junior college that was educationally suited; and only 20.8 percent ranked near their home as the first reason. 8.9 percent ranked low cost as first.

Other studies point up the fact that accessibility of educational institutions and the low tuition are indispensible

TABLE 15

NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE FAMILY OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS

		Alumni Groups			Total Alumni	Current Students	Total Group
		(1947-48)	(1957-58)	(1960-61)		(1965-66)	
Public		N=321	N=650	N= 835	N=1806	N=1024	N=2831
Private		N= 83	N=360	N= 494	N= 381	N= 936	N=1317
Total Group		N=404	N=1010	N=1329	N=2743	N=1405	N=4148[a]
		%	%	%	%	%	%
One							
	Public	11.7	16.0	14.8	14.9	10.6	13.3
	Private	15.7	18.6	13.2	15.9	12.8	15.1
	Total Group	12.1	16.9	14.1	14.8	11.2	13.6
Two							
	Public	32.8	30.8	28.7	30.4	29.3	30.1
	Private	34.9	36.2	37.5	36.5	34.2	35.9
	Total Group	33.3	32.9	31.8	32.5	30.6	32.1
Three							
	Public	27.9	24.1	23.6	24.7	25.6	25.1
	Private	15.7	23.2	26.3	22.9	22.2	22.1
	Total Group	25.4	23.7	24.5	24.4	24.7	24.6

Four						
Public	10.5	14.1	15.3	13.9	15.8	14.3
Private	19.3	11.9	12.2	13.5	15.4	14.7
Total Group	12.8	13.4	14.9	14.1	15.7	14.5
Five						
Public	6.2	6.7	6.7	6.6	8.7	7.3
Private	4.8	4.2	5.6	4.9	7.8	5.6
Total Group	6.9	5.8	6.3	6.0	8.5	6.4
Six or more						
Public	10.8	8.0	10.6	9.6	10.0	9.9
Private	9.6	5.8	5.2	6.3	7.1	6.7
Total Group	10.5	7.2	8.5	8.4	9.2	8.7

---

[a] Excludes 23 who did not provide this information.

TABLE 16

REASONS GIVEN BY JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS FOR ATTENDING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

	Alumni Groups			Total Alumni	Current Students	Total Group
	(1947-48)	(1957-58)	(1960-61)		(1965-66)	
Public	N=321	N= 649	N= 835	N=1805	N=1028	N=2833
Private	N= 81	N= 335	N= 487	N= 922	N= 378	N=1301
Total Group	N=402	N=1004	N=1322	N=2728	N=1406	N=4134[a]
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Ranked First Choice						
Live at home						
Public	51.7	51.1	43.9	48.3	35.9	45.3
Private	30.1	18.1	15.6	19.5	19.3	20.8
Total Group	47.3	39.4	33.3	38.5	31.4	37.4
Low cost						
Public	26.3	28.7	28.7	28.2	32.2	29.5
Private	8.4	8.3	8.6	8.4	10.4	8.9
Total Group	22.7	21.4	21.2	21.6	26.3	22.9
Educationally Suited						
Public	10.3	8.1	10.0	9.3	14.5	10.4
Private	30.1	27.2	33.2	30.2	29.6	30.0
Total Group	13.1	14.9	18.7	16.1	18.3	16.6

Ranked Second Choice						
Live at home						
Public	33.7	23.9	29.1	28.0	32.6	29.6
Private	13.8	9.5	9.5	10.4	10.3	10.2
Total Group	22.7	21.4	21.2	21.6	26.3	22.9
Low cost						
Public	48.3	52.8	47.0	49.6	40.8	47.2
Private	32.3	23.9	20.5	24.2	24.5	25.3
Total Group	40.9	37.4	32.2	36.0	33.5	35.8
Educationally suited						
Public	8.0	8.7	7.0	7.9	10.4	8.5
Private	12.3	30.4	25.4	24.8	24.8	24.8
Total Group	7.9	13.0	11.0	11.2	12.7	11.2

---

[a] Excludes 37 who did not supply this information.

to universal education beyond high school. Medsker, for example, reported the reasons for junior college students selecting the two-year institution are as follows: "Two-thirds of these students listed (1) persuasion by parents, counselors, and friends, (2) location of the college (proximity), or (3) lower cost. These same reasons have been reported in numerous unpublished studies."[1] Public junior college honor students fit the pattern of this and other studies on reasons for attending a junior college more closely than do the students of private junior colleges.

Student Employment

Over one-third of the honor students in this study were gainfully employed and worked 10 or more hours per week while they attended the junior college; over 6 percent were employed for thirty or more hours per week. Table 17 shows the amount of time these former junior college honor students worked based on five time categories.

Honor students in private junior colleges held outside employment much less frequently than did those students in the public schools. Slightly less than half (49.9%) of the private junior college honor students were gainfully employed while attending the junior college as compared to 61.5 percent of the public junior college students. For the total public junior college group 6.9 percent were employed for

---

[1] Medsker, op. cit., p. 41.

TABLE 17

AMOUNT OF OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT PER WEEK FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS

Hours per Week Employed		Alumni Groups			Total Alumni	Current Students	Total Group
		(1947-48)	(1957-58)	(1960-61)		(1965-66)	
	Public	N=322	N= 645	N= 832	N=1799	N=1018	N=2817
	Private	N= 83	N= 359	N= 493	N=1313	N= 378	N=4129
	Total Group	N=405	N=1004	N=1325	N=2734	N=1396	N=4130[a]
		%	%	%	%	%	%
None							
	Public	31.6	38.8	34.9	35.8	44.5	38.8
	Private	49.4	49.8	51.3	50.6	52.3	51.1
	Total Group	35.2	43.4	41.6	40.8	45.7	41.9
Less than 10							
	Public	20.1	14.1	18.7	17.1	19.3	18.2
	Private	16.9	22.8	20.4	20.7	24.9	21.7
	Total Group	19.5	17.1	19.2	18.4	20.7	19.1

Ten to 19						
Public	21.7	20.8	25.8	23.0	21.4	22.4
Private	20.5	17.2	20.8	19.3	16.4	18.4
Total Group	21.4	19.3	23.7	21.7	20.0	21.1
Twenty to 29						
Public	17.0	16.5	13.3	15.3	9.0	13.4
Private	9.6	7.2	4.9	6.8	3.4	5.8
Total Group	15.5	13.0	10.1	12.3	7.5	11.4
Thirty or more						
Public	9.3	9.8	6.9	8.5	5.6	6.9
Private	3.6	2.8	2.4	2.8	2.9	2.9
Total Group	8.1	7.2	5.2	6.6	4.9	6.4

---

[a] Excludes 41 who did not supply this information.

thirty or more hours per week as compared to 2.9 percent for the private junior college group. This is further evidence that these private junior college honor students were from homes which could meet the financial obligations of higher education more easily than in the case of those who attended public junior colleges.

Summary

Approximately one-fourth of these junior college honor students were older than the typical beginning college students (18 years of age or younger) at the time of entering junior college. Nearly two-thirds of them were women including 57.6 percent of those who attended public institutions. This is a much higher proportion than their overall representation in the public junior college population. Less than seven percent of these honor students were or had been married at the time they entered junior college.

A large proportion of this group came from lower socio-economic level families. Only 16.2 percent of those who attended public junior colleges were from families where the head of the household's occupation was classified as professional or semi-professional. Those who attended private junior colleges represented a much higher socio-economic class than did those who attended public institutions.

Over three-fifths of these honor students were the first of their families to continue formal education beyond high school. The mothers had slightly more education than the fathers, and the educational level was slightly higher for both mothers and fathers of private than of public junior college honor students. Slightly over half of these honor students were from families which consisted of two or three children; however, over eight percent were from families with six or more children.

Over one-third of the total group attended the junior college because of its proximity, over one-fifth because of low cost. Although cost and living at home were reasons reported by the honor students for attending private junior colleges, nearly one-third gave "suitability of the educational program" as their first consideration.

Nearly three-fifths of the total group were gainfully employed while attending a junior college although slightly less than one-fifth of them worked less than 10 hours per week. For the total group, over six percent were employed for 30 or more hours per week. A higher proportion of the honor students from public than from private junior colleges were engaged in outside employment.

CHAPTER III

THE COLLEGE EXPERIENCE OF PHI THETA KAPPA MEMBERS

"The diversity of its student body imposes on the two-year college the responsibility of providing an equally diverse educational program."[1] The junior college serves students with abilities ranging from the lowest to the highest. Some of these pursue occupational programs which vary in length from a few months to two years. Others enter transfer programs with the intention of continuing their education in senior colleges and universities. The question is raised: Can institutions that are engaged in educating diverse students in diverse programs serve creditably the various ability groups?

This chapter deals with the adequacy of certain aspects of the junior college transfer program as viewed by junior college honor students who continued their education in senior institutions, with their education and honors in the senior colleges, and with a comparison of certain academic aspects of junior and senior colleges. Specifically, this chapter presents information on the following subjects: (1) the amount of formal education obtained by the honor students; (2) reasons given for some transferring from junior college before graduation; (3) reasons given for some not graduating from a senior institution; (4) academic honors and leadership experience in senior colleges; (5) comparisons of junior and senior college counseling and guidance programs, teaching, class work, and grade point averages; (6) graduation schedule; and (7) evaluation of the junior college.

---

[1] Medsker, op. cit., p. 51.

Amount of Formal Education

Analyses regarding formal education were made in terms of sex by each alumni group. However, where no differences were found in their patterns of response these breakdowns have been omitted from the tables.

The majority of the 2,758 respondents had completed two full years in the junior college. Table 18 shows the amount of junior college work completed in terms of four categories. There appears to be a modest trend toward honor students completing more hours in the junior college. Table 18 shows that whereas for the 1947-48 group 76.4 percent received the junior college degree, the percentage for the 1960-61 group was 79.8 percent.

A considerably higher proportion of the men than women continued their education in senior institutions. An

TABLE 18

JUNIOR COLLEGE CREDITS OBTAINED BY HONOR STUDENT ALUMNI

	1947-48 N=405	1957-58 N=1008	1960-61 N=1325	Total Group[a] N=2738
Credits	%	%	%	%
Less than 30 semester or 45 quarter hours	1.0	1.2	1.3	1.2
Thirty to 45 semester or 45-60 quarter hours	11.6	13.3	11.2	12.3
Over 45 semester or 60 quarter hours without junior college degree	10.8	6.0	6.6	7.5
Received junior college degree	76.4	79.0	79.8	79.0

[a] Excludes 20 who did not provide this information.

examination of Table 19 shows that 90.9 percent of the men entered senior college compared to 68.3 percent of the women. Further, there has been a decrease in the proportion of junior college women honor students who continue on to senior college dropping from 77.9 percent in 1947-48 to 61.1 percent in 1960-61.

A higher proportion of the men than women received bachelor's degrees or higher. Only 64.1 percent of the women received at least a baccalaureate degree as compared to 88.8 percent for the men. Nearly one-third of the men (31.9 percent) obtained a graduate or professional degree

TABLE 19

DISTRIBUTION OF JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS WHO TRANSFERRED TO SENIOR COLLEGE

Groups		Transfers				Total Group	
		Men		Women			
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1947-48 Alumni	(N= 406)	136	91.3	200	77.9	336	82.7
1957-58 Alumni	(N=1013)	315	91.1	485	72.7	800	79.0
1960-61 Alumni	(N=1339)	463	90.6	556	61.1	1019	76.1
Total Alumni	(N=2758)	914	90.9	1241	68.3	2155	78.1

as compared to only 8.7 percent for the women. Further, Table 20 shows that 7.7 percent of the men had earned doctorate degrees at the time data for this study were collected as compared to only 0.2 percent of the women, and 4.1 percent of the men had professional degrees as compared to 0.5 percent of the women.

Reasons Given For Not Graduating From The Junior College

Table 18 shows that over three-fourths of these junior college honor students (79.0%) were graduated from the junior college. From Table 21 it can be seen that of those who did not complete a junior college program the vast majority transferred to another college, 90.4 percent of the men and 62.3 percent of the women. The differences

TABLE 20

HIGHEST DEGREE RECEIVED BY JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS COMPARED BY YEAR AND SEX

	1947-48		1957-58		1960-61		Total Group[a]	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Highest Degree N's =	149	256	346	666	510	827	1005	1749
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
No degree	4.7	9.3	3.4	8.5	3.3	11.0	3.5	9.8
Associate in Arts	10.1	20.2	6.3	24.5	9.2	28.4	7.7	26.1
Bachelor's	63.7	65.3	55.2	57.5	55.5	51.3	57.0	55.2
Master's	14.7	5.1	21.7	8.8	21.2	8.4	20.1	8.0
Professional	2.0	0.0	4.8	0.3	4.1	0.8	4.1	0.5
Doctorate	4.7	0.0	8.7	0.4	7.8	0.0	7.7	0.2

[a] Excludes four who did not provide this information.

between those who attended public and private junior colleges were nominal for men, but somewhat more women who attended private institutions (65.2%) than those who attended public institutions (60.1%) transferred before completing junior college.

Of those who discontinued their education before completing junior college, the most frequent reason given by women was marriage (19.9 percent of all those who did not complete junior college). The percentage was only slightly higher for women who attended

TABLE 21

REASONS FOR HONOR STUDENTS' NOT COMPLETING THE JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAM

Reasons	Public Men N=151 %	Public Women N=178 %	Private Men N=27 %	Private Women N=138 %	Total Men N=178 %	Total Women N=316 %
Transfer to another college	90.0	60.1	92.6	65.2	90.4	62.3
Lack of financial resources	2.0	5.1	3.7	8.0	2.3	6.4
Desire to go to work	2.6	6.7	0.0	1.4	2.2	4.4
Personal health problems	0.7	1.1	0.0	2.2	0.6	1.6
Lack of interest to continue college	0.0	0.6	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.9
Enter military service	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0
Enter a specialized program	0.7	5.1	0.0	2.2	0.6	3.8
Parents encouraged withdrawal	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.6
Marriage	0.7	21.3	3.7	18.1	1.2	19.9

public junior college (21.3 percent) than for those who attended private junior colleges (18.1 percent). Of the few men who discontinued college, most gave as their reason for doing so one of the following: (1) enter military service, (2) lack of financial resources, or (3) desire to go to work.

Reasons For Transferring From The Junior College

Table 22 presents an analysis of the reasons given by these honor students for transferring to another institution before completing junior college. Since over three-fourths (79.0%) of the junior college honor students graduated before transferring to another college, the number represented in Table 22 is small. Over 52 percent (52.8%) of the group who transferred before completing junior college reported that they did so because their educational needs could not be satisfied in the junior college. The next largest group (7.2 percent) reported that they transferred because of a specific junior college requirement they did not want to complete. A few of the groups gave such reasons as: (1) junior college work considered substandard (4.3 percent), (2) limited extra-curricular activities (2.7 percent), and (3) wanted to leave home environment (2.7 percent). A variety of other reason, too few in each case to categorize, constituted 28.3 percent of the responses.

Consideration on Transferring Again

A high percentage of those who transferred from the junior college without graduating reported that they would do so again (Table 23). The fact that most of that group (see Table 22) transferred either because of an educational need that could not be satisfied in the junior college or because

TABLE 22

REASONS HONOR STUDENTS TRANSFERRED FROM JUNIOR COLLEGE BEFORE GRADUATION

Reasons	Alumni Groups (1947-48) N=64	(1957-58) N=145	(1960-61) N=172	Total Alumni N=381
	%	%	%	%
Junior college work considered substandard	4.7	2.1	5.8	4.3
Educational needs not satisfied	51.6	54.5	51.7	52.8
Limited extra-curricular activities	1.5	2.8	2.0	2.7
Senior college more prestigious	0.0	2.1	1.7	1.7
Wanted to leave home environment	1.5	1.4	4.1	2.7
Not willing to complete specific requirements	12.5	9.0	5.2	7.2
Other	28.1	28.3	27.9	28.3

they were not willing to complete specific requirements, probably explains this type of response in Table 23.

TABLE 23

RESPONSES BY HONOR STUDENTS TO THE QUESTION ABOUT THEIR TRANSFERRING AGAIN

Responses	Alumni Groups (1947-48) N=64	Alumni Groups (1957-58) N=155	Alumni Groups (1960-61) N=182	Total Alumni N=401
	%	%	%	%
Definitely would	43.7	49.7	42.3	45.4
Probably would	43.7	27.1	33.5	32.7
Possibly would	7.8	12.9	14.8	13.0
Probably would not	3.1	9.0	6.0	6.7
Definitely would not	1.6	1.3	2.7	2.0

Reasons Given for not Graduating from Senior College

Table 19 shows that 97.6 percent of the men and 90.3 percent of the women who transferred graduated from senior college. Marriage and the lack of financial resources were the two reasons given most frequently for not obtaining a senior college degree (Table 24). For the women, 56.6 percent reported that they did not graduate because of marriage as compared to 10.9 percent for the men; 10.6 percent of the women and 18.2 percent of the men reported that they did not graduate because of financial reasons. Few of the women indicated that they withdrew from senior college because of family reasons, but 9.1 percent of the men gave this as their reason and another 9.1 percent reported leaving to enter

TABLE 24

REASONS GIVEN BY JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS FOR NOT GRADUATING FROM SENIOR COLLEGES

Reasons	Public		Private		Total	
	Men N=50 %	Women N=61 %	Men N=5 %	Women N=81 %	Men N=55 %	Women N=142 %
Work too difficult	4.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.7
No interest to continue formal education	0.0	4.9	0.0	2.5	0.0	3.5
Lack of financial resources	20.0	16.4	0.0	6.2	18.3	10.6
Withdrew for family reasons	8.0	1.6	20.0	3.7	9.1	2.8
Entered military service	6.0	0.0	40.0	1.3	9.1	0.7
Married	10.0	39.3	20.0	59.1	10.9	50.6
Other	52.0	36.1	20.0	27.2	49.1	31.0

military service. The "other" category used by nearly half of the men (49.1 percent) and nearly one-third of the women (31.0 percent) did not show a pattern of response that could be placed in separate categories. Table 24 shows that differences occurred between honor students who attended public and those who attended private junior colleges. However, the numbers are so small as to preclude generalizing.

Academic Honors

As can be seen from Table 25 a large proportion of the junior college honor students in this study received academic recognition in the senior institutions to which they transferred. Nearly two-thirds were members of an academic honorary organization, received an academic scholarship, or were recognized in some other manner for their scholastic achievement. Over one-third of these honor students (36.3 percent) became members of a specific academic honorary organization such as in science or history, and nearly one-fifth (19.4 percent) were members of Phi Beta Kappa or other general scholastic honorary organization. An academic scholarship was awarded to 25.1 percent of these students, and 21.7 percent were honored for their academic excellence in some other manner in the senior college.

Leadership Experiences

Over 40 percent of these junior college honor students reported that they were elected to leadership roles at the senior college or university to which they transferred. It will be noted from Table 26 that those who attended private institutions reported slightly more activity in leadership roles than did those who attended public institutions. Elected to office in student government were 4.3 percent; 3.3 percent became class officers; 25.9 percent were

TABLE 25

JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS' ACADEMIC RECOGNITION IN SENIOR COLLEGE

Academic Recognition	Public N=1446 %[b]	Private N=688 %[b]	Total[a] N=2134 %[b]
Member of a general scholastic honorary such as Phi Beta Kappa	20.8	16.4	19.4
Member of a specific academic honorary such as in science or history	37.5	33.7	36.3
Awarded an academic scholarship	27.9	19.2	25.1
Other such as awards for achievement in academic areas	21.6	21.8	21.7
None	34.4	40.6	36.4

[a] Excludes 624 who did not provide this information.

[b] These percentages exceed 100 because more than one honor was given to some respondents.

elected to office in campus clubs; 2.3 percent held offices in athletic clubs; and 17.5 percent held an office in some other type of organization.

Leadership experiences of these junior college honor graduates also included participation in extracurricular activities, such as being members of the newspaper staff, working on the year book, and participating in students club work as is shown in Table 27. Of these honor

TABLE 26

ELECTED OFFICES HELD BY JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS IN SENIOR INSTITUTIONS

Offices	Public N=1421	Private N=689	Total Group[a] N=2110
	%[b]	%[b]	%[b]
Student government	3.7	5.5	4.3
Class officer	2.5	4.9	3.3
Campus club	25.3	27.1	25.9
Athletic club	2.0	2.9	2.3
Other organization	16.5	19.6	17.5
None	59.8	54.9	58.2

[a] Excludes 648 who did not provide this information.

[b] These percentages exceed 100 because more than one office was held by some respondents.

students, 5.0 percent reported that they became members of the newspaper staff in the senior college, and 3.3 percent members of the yearbook staff. Over one-third (36.7 percent) indicated that they were active in club work, and 35.5 percent in other extra-curricular activities.

Counseling and Guidance

Counseling and guidance, was assessed in terms of its adequacy and compared with counseling received by these students in senior institutions.

TABLE 27

EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES PARTICIPATED IN BY JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS IN SENIOR INSTITUTIONS

Activities	Public N=1444 %[b]	Private N=694 %[b]	Total Group[a] N=2138 %[b]
Member newspaper staff	4.6	5.8	5.0
Member yearbook staff	1.9	6.2	3.3
Club work	35.4	39.3	36.7
Other activity	34.1	38.3	35.5
None	39.5	33.9	37.7

[a] Excludes 620 who did not provide this information.

[b] These combined percentages exceed 100 because one person could participate in more than one activity.

An examination of Table 28 shows that over one-third (34.7 percent) rated junior college counseling and guidance adequate; nearly one-third (31.3 percent) rated it good; and over one-fifth (21.6 percent) rated it excellent. Only 12.4 percent considered junior college counseling and guidance inadequate. Counseling and guidance programs were rated as somewhat better by private than by public junior college honor students.

Senior college and university counseling and guidance services were not rated as high as those of the junior college. Table 29 shows that the senior college programs were rated inadequate by over one-fifth (21.6 percent) of these junior

TABLE 28

RATINGS OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE PROGRAMS BY JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS

Ratings	Alumni[a]		Current[a]		Total Group
	Public N=1510 %	Private N=667 %	Public N=1008 %	Private N=381 %	N=3566 %
Inadequate	11.0	9.7	15.7	13.6	12.4
Adequate	36.2	30.5	36.1	32.3	34.7
Good	30.7	33.6	31.2	29.7	31.3
Excellent	21.9	26.1	17.1	24.4	21.6

[a] Excludes the 581 alumni and 24 current honor students who did not provide this information.

TABLE 29

RATINGS OF THE SENIOR COLLEGE COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE PROGRAMS BY JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS

Ratings	Public N=1491 %	Private N=663 %	Total Group[a] N=2154 %
Inadequate	20.2	24.9	21.6
Adequate	44.3	41.8	43.5
Good	22.8	21.8	22.5
Excellent	12.6	11.4	12.2

[a] Excludes 604 who did not provide this information.

college honor students. The largest group (43.5 percent) considered it adequate. Over one-fifth (22.5 percent) thought it was good, and nearly one-eighth (12.2 percent) rated it excellent. Public senior colleges were rated slightly better in counseling and guidance to the private senior colleges.

Junior college counseling and guidance programs were rated superior to those of the senior college (Table 30). Nearly one-fifth (18.6 percent) of these honor students rated these services in the junior college as definitely better; 25.7 percent rated them somewhat better; and 40.1 percent rated them about equal to those in senior colleges. Only 13.0 percent rated these services in the junior college somewhat poorer than those in senior colleges and but 2.6 percent rated them much poorer. Former private junior college honor students gave better ratings for their institutions than did former public junior college honor students.

Comparison of Teaching

Two types of comparisons of teaching between junior and senior college were obtained. These honor students were asked (1) to make an overall comparison of the quality of the teaching they had received in the two types of institutions, and (2) to identify and compare their best junior college teacher with their best senior college teacher. Several factors favor the senior college in such a comparison. First, a student's studies during his senior

TABLE 30

COMPARISON BY JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS OF JUNIOR AND SENIOR COLLEGE COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE SERVICES

Comparisons	Public N=1488	Private N=656	Total Group[a] N=2144
	%	%	%
Junior college much poorer	2.8	2.1	2.6
Junior college somewhat poorer	13.2	12.7	13.0
About equal	42.3	35.1	40.1
Junior college somewhat better	25.6	25.9	25.7
Junior college definitely better	16.1	24.2	18.6

[a] Excludes 614 who did not provide this information.

and junior years are concentrated in his major field. Second, upper division classes in senior college are typically smaller than are lower division classes in these same institutions. Third, of the faculty who teach undergraduate courses in senior institutions (especially large ones) upper division courses tend to be staffed by professors who are presumed to be better qualified than those who teach lower division courses in the same institution.

Assuming, however, that senior colleges are not favored in such a comparison, the scale is still balanced in favor of the junior college (See Table 31). Over half of these honor students (55.3 percent) rated the instruction about

TABLE 31

COMPARISON BY JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS OF JUNIOR COLLEGE TEACHING WITH SENIOR COLLEGE TEACHING

Comparison	Public N=1506 %	Private N=666 %	Total Group[a] N=2172 %
Junior college instruction significantly poorer	2.2	3.3	2.5
Junior college instruction somewhat poorer	14.2	17.6	15.2
About equal in instruction	57.4	50.5	55.3
Junior college instruction somewhat better	18.1	18.0	18.1
Junior college instruction significantly better	8.2	10.4	8.9

[a] Excludes 586 who did not provide this information.

equal in the two types of institutions; 15.2 percent rated the senior college instruction superior to some degree; and 18.1 percent rated junior college instruction superior. Only 2.5 percent considered senior college teaching significantly superior while 8.9 percent considered the junior college teaching significantly superior.

In the second type of comparison between junior and senior college teaching, these honor students were asked to name their best junior college instructor and their best senior college instructor. Next, they were requested to designate which of the two was better. The results are presented in Table 32. The "best" senior college instructor was rated above his "best" junior college counterpart by a slight degree, 38.6 percent to 35.4 percent. Twenty-six percent of those who made identifications of the two "best" instructors declined to rate one over the other.

TABLE 32

COMPARISON OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE "BEST" INSTRUCTOR AND THE SENIOR COLLEGE "BEST" INSTRUCTOR

	Total Alumni	
Comparison	Number[a]	Percent
Junior college "best"	638	35.4
Senior college "best"	696	38.6
No difference	469	26.0
TOTALS	1803	100.0

[a] Excludes 955 who did not provide this information.

Comparison of Class Work

The consensus of these junior college honor students was that the class work on the senior level was more difficult than that undertaken in junior college. The view that a good student is able to relax somewhat after successfully completing his first two years of college is not substantiated by this study. As Table 33 shows, approximately one-fourth (25.1 percent) of these honor students reported that the senior college work was significantly harder, and 35.5 percent said it was somewhat harder. However, one in three (33.2 percent) thought that the senior college work was no more difficult than that of the junior college. Public junior college honor students rated the senior college work harder than did the private junior college students. Possibly this is because there was a larger proportion of men in that group, many of whom majored in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering as is shown in Chapter V.

TABLE 33

COMPARISON BY JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS OF DIFFICULTY OF COLLEGE WORK IN JUNIOR AND SENIOR COLLEGES

Comparisons	Public N=1447	Private N=633	Total Group[a] N-2080
	%	%	%
Senior college class work significantly harder	25.8	23.6	25.0
Somewhat harder than junior college	36.9	32.6	35.5
About the same as junior college	32.0	36.0	33.2
Somewhat easier than junior college	4.8	6.3	5.3
Significantly easier than junior college	0.5	1.5	0.8

[a] Excludes 678 who did not provide this information.

Grade Point Average

A majority of these honor students who transferred reported that they maintained their junior college grade average the first year after transferring to senior college. This information is presented in Table 34. Nearly two-fifths (38.6 percent) reported that their grades remained about the same. Another 7.5 percent indicated that their grades improved. An additional 12.2 percent reported an initial drop in grades but subsequent improvement to where their senior college grade average at the end of the first year after transferring equalled or exceeded their junior college grade point averages.

Since this group had a grade average of at least "B" at the time of transfer, the chances of experiencing a drop in grade were maximized. It should not be surprising, therefore, that nearly one-third (31.7 percent) reported a drop in grade point average the first year after transferring. However, only 12.8 percent stated that the drop amounted to as much as one letter grade.

Graduation Schedule

Those who transferred to senior colleges were asked if they graduated on schedule and if not how long they were delayed. The results appear in Table 35. Most of the group (83 percent) reported no delay in senior college graduation. Of the remainder, only 3.1 percent reported that they were delayed by more than a quarter or a semester and 6.6 percent indicated that they were delayed by only a summer. Public junior college honor students had a slightly better record of graduating on time than did those who attended the private colleges.

TABLE 34

CHANGE IN OVERALL GRADE AVERAGE OF JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS AFTER FIRST YEAR TRANSFER TO SENIOR COLLEGES

Change	Public N=1796	Private N=927	Total Group[a] N=2723
	%	%	%
Dropped considerably (one letter grade or more)	13.4	11.7	12.8
Dropped somewhat	28.0	30.1	28.9
Dropped initially but improved to equal or better	12.5	11.6	12.2
Remained about the same	38.8	38.1	38.6
Increased	7.1	8.4	7.5

[a] Excludes 35 who did not provide this information.

This pattern of graduation on schedule is nearly twice that found by Knoell and Medsler which included all junior college transfer students. They report that only 45 percent of the students who transferred with junior standing graduated two years after transfer and about half of those

TABLE 35

GRADUATION SCHEDULE OF JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS AFTER TRANSFER TO SENIOR INSTITUTIONS

Graduation	Public N=1720	Private N=873	Total Group[a] N=2593
	%	%	%
On schedule	83.5	81.9	83.0
Delayed by a summer term	6.3	7.2	6.6
Delayed by a quarter or a semester	7.3	7.4	7.3
Delayed by more than a semester	3.0	3.4	3.1

[a] This excludes 165 who did not provide this information.

who did not do so were still enrolled for another semester or year.[1] After examining several factors that might be responsible for delay, Knoell and Medsker concluded that "most of the students who did not graduate on time simply lacked enough credit to do so, as a result of reduced course load and, in a small number of cases, course failures or repetition."[2]

The Medsker and Trent study, reported in The Research Reporter, presents information on the success of college students in general receiving their bachelor's degree after four years of college enrollment. They report:

---

[1] Knoell and Medsker, op. cit., p. 26.

[2] Ibid., p. 32.

> Of those who started college, most did not "go away"--55 percent entered local colleges. They did not spend four years on the quad [sic]--one-half dropped out and many changed colleges at least once. And they did not emerge "on time" with a bachelor's degree--28 percent obtained their degrees in four years but almost as many (24 percent) were still in college but had not qualified for a degree. . . . These data lay to rest any stereotype of today's high school graduates as proceeding in orderly fashion from high school through four years in college.[1]

The junior college honor students included in this study were much more successful than the Medsker and Trent sample who entered college in emerging after four years with the baccalaureate degree.

Evaluation of the Junior College

The questionnaire contained several items, the responses to which provided an evaluation of the junior college by these honor students. One item asked if they thought that a student of high ability can obtain as good an education in a junior college during his first two years as he can in a senior college during his first two years. The results appear in Table 36. Over two-fifths of the alumni (43.7 percent) and 41.4 percent of the current students stated that they thought he definitely can and another 31.0 percent of the alumni and 38.2 percent of the current students believe that he probably can. Only 2.8 percent of the alumni and 2.5

---

[1] The Research Reporter, The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, Vol. II, No. 1, 1967, p. 2.

percent of the current sutdents expressed the view that a student of high ability is definitely penalized by attending a junior college during his first two years and another 5.8 percent of the alumni and 2.5 percent of the current students were of the opinion that he is probably penalized. Differences were nominal between the responses by type of institution and for the current as compared to the alumni group.

Another item asked was if they would again attend a junior college. Table 37 shows that most expressed the view that they probably would (36.7 percent) or definitely would (31.6 percent) enroll in junior college if they were making the decision again. Only 6.1 percent reported that they definitely would not and 25.4 percent said they possibly would again enter a junior college. The current students were somewhat more disposed than the alumni to be definitely of the opinion that they would repeat their decision to enter a junior college. There was also stronger sentiment on the part of the public institution group than of the private institution group for repeating their decision.

A third question included to obtain their evaluation of the junior college, asked whether the honor students have sent or plan to send their own children to junior college. The results appear in Table 38. The fact that the majority of the alumni members are new professional workers or the wives of professionals makes this evaluation especially significant. Over half of the alumni (52.6 percent) and 58.9

TABLE 36

CONSIDERATION BY JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS AS TO WHETHER A STUDENT OF HIGH ABILITY CAN GET AS GOOD EDUCATION THE FIRST TWO YEARS IN A JUNIOR COLLEGE AS IN A SENIOR COLLEGE

Responses	Public		Private		Total Group[a]	
	Alumni N=1771	Current N=1021	Alumni N=931	Current N=380	Alumni N=2702	Current N=1401
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Definitely not	2.8	2.0	2.7	3.7	2.8	2.5
Probably not	6.1	2.4	5.3	3.7	5.8	2.8
Possibly can	15.6	14.2	18.4	17.6	16.6	15.1
Probably can	29.7	38.0	33.5	38.6	31.0	38.2
Definitely can	45.7	43.4	40.0	36.3	43.7	41.4

[a] Excludes 12 current students and 56 alumni who did not provide this information.

TABLE 37

RESPONSES AS TO WHETHER HONOR STUDENTS WOULD AGAIN ATTEND JUNIOR COLLEGE

Responses	Public			Private			Public and Private[a]		
	Current Students N=1027	Alumni N=1804	Total Group N=2831	Current Students N=380	Alumni N=937	Total Group N=1317	Current Students N=1408	Alumni N=2741	Total Group N=4148
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Definitely would	43.9	37.4	39.9	34.2	28.2	29.8	41.8	34.8	36.9
Probably would	33.9	32.4	32.9	30.8	28.6	28.9	32.8	31.0	31.6
Possibly would	18.6	26.0	23.2	25.1	32.5	30.8	20.2	27.5	25.4
Definitely not	3.5	4.4	4.1	9.9	10.7	10.5	5.2	6.6	6.1

[a] Excludes 6 current students and 23 alumni who did not provide this information.

TABLE 38

CONSIDERATION BY JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS AS TO WHETHER THEY WILL SEND THEIR OWN CHILDREN TO JUNIOR COLLEGES

Responses	Public		Private		Total Group[a]	
	Alumni N=1459	Current N=993	Alumni N=740	Current N=368	Alumni N=2199	Current N=1361
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Definitely not	1.7	1.0	3.2	3.8	2.2	1.8
Probably not	12.1	7.7	18.3	12.0	14.2	8.9
Possibly not	15.7	19.4	22.2	25.0	17.9	20.9
Probably would	54.5	60.7	48.9	54.1	52.6	58.9
Definitely would	15.9	11.1	7.4	5.2	13.0	9.5

[a] Excludes 52 current students and 559 alumni who did not provide this information.

percent, of the current students reported that they probably would send their own children to the junior college. Another 13.0 percent of the alumni and 9.5 percent of the current students reported that they definitely would send their own children to junior college. Only 2.2 percent of the alumni and 1.8 percent of the current students definitely do not intend to send their children to a junior college; 14.2 percent of alumni and 8.9 percent of the current students expressed the view that they probably would not send their own children to junior college. Public junior college honor students were more strongly in favor of sending their own children to junior colleges than were those from the private junior institutions.

Summary

Most junior college honor students continue their education at a senior college or university and succeed in obtaining their baccalaureate degrees in the usual length of time. Those who withdraw from the senior college usually do so to get married or because they lack the financial resources. The men transfer to senior colleges and universities in greater numbers and continue their formal education longer than do the women.

Most of the students who leave the junior college before graduation state that they do so because (a) junior college could not satisfy their educational needs or (b) there is a specific junior college requirement they do not want to complete.

Most junior college honor students continue to demonstrate scholarship and leadership in the senior college or university. Overall, they rate junior college counseling and guidance programs better than those in senior colleges. They rate instruction in the junior college somewhat better than that in the senior college. However, slightly more of them rank their "best" senior college teacher above their "best" junior college teacher than the converse. The class work was rated more difficult in the senior college, but a majority of these who transferred to senior colleges maintained their junior college grade point average their first year after transferring. Most of the group experienced no delay in senior college graduation.

In general these honor students would return to a junior college again if they were just beginning college work. They consider that a student of high ability can obtain as good an education the first two years in a junior college as in a senior institution. Over half of the honor students report that they intend to send their own children to a junior college.

CHAPTER IV

AN EVALUATION OF THE PHI THETA KAPPA FRATERNITY BY CURRENT AND ALUMNI MEMBERS

This chapter deals with the evaluation of the Phi Theta Kappa Fraternity itself by its current and alumni members. It is concerned with the effectiveness of the organization in carrying out its stated purpose; the value of Phi Theta Kappa to its membership; the value of its meetings in local chapters and its state, regional, and national conventions; and the value of the activities of the chapters at the local level. Responses from the students by type of junior college and by sex revealed no pattern of differences on the items reported in this chapter. Therefore, these data are reported without reference to type of institution or to sex. Percentages for each table are based on the number of students responding to the item. Several of the items reported were of a "free response" type. This accounts for the limited number of students represented in some of the analyses.

Views on Phi Theta Kappa Membership

As shown by Table 39 members of Phi Theta Kappa feel strongly that the organization is worth recommending to other honor students. Nearly three-fourths (73.7 percent) of those included in this study reported that they would definitely recommend it to someone eligible for membership and somewhat over another one-fifth said they would probably recommend it. Further, a higher percentage of current students (76.4 percent) than alumni students (70.9 percent) were of this opinion. Less than one percent stated that they would not recommend the organization for other honor students, and only 3 percent said that they probably or possibly would not recommend it. So, in general, endorsement of the organization was good.

Junior college honor students consider that membership in Phi Theta Kappa is of the greatest significance to them in the areas of encouragement toward high academic standards and of satisfaction of having done something well. Over four-fifths of the total group indicated they thought the national honor fraternity was encouraging scholarship among junior college honor students. Approximately 90 percent ranked the sense of accomplishment the highest of the areas of value in Phi Theta Kappa. The areas of social (made new friends), educational (encouraged high academic standards), and personal encouragement (developed leadership), were considered of significant value by over two-fifths of

TABLE 39

CONSIDERATION BY CURRENT AND ALUMNI PHI THETA KAPPA MEMBERS AS TO WHETHER THEY WOULD RECOMMEND MEMBERSHIP TO OTHERS

Responses	Total Alumni N=1338 %	Current Students N=1404 %	Total Group N=2792[a] %
Definitely not	0.7	0.8	0.7
Probably not	1.5	0.7	1.1
Possibly not	2.2	1.5	1.9
Probably would	24.6	20.5	22.5
Definitely would	70.9	76.4	73.7

[a] Excludes 9 current students and 1370 alumni members who did not supply this information.

the respondents. Nearly one-half felt that it helped them socially in making new friends; and two-fifths believed it helped them in developing leadership qualities. Table 40 presents this information. An examination of Table 40 reveals notable differences between the rankings of the current and alumni groups. The current group ranked all areas except the sense of accomplishment somewhat higher than did the alumni group.

Membership in Phi Theta Kappa was considered to be fairly important or of great importance by 86.1 percent of these current and alumni honor students. For current students the percentage was 95.8 percent compared to 81.2

TABLE 40

VALUES OF PHI THETA KAPPA MEMBERSHIP TO CURRENT AND ALUMNI MEMBERS[a]

Values	Total Alumni N=803 %	Current Students N=1389 %	Total Group N=2292[b] %
Encouraged high academic standards	77.0	91.9	85.9
Made new friends	40.6	67.4	57.1
Assisted in all phases of education	34.8	61.9	51.1
Developed leadership	36.8	61.0	51.3
Sense of accomplishment	95.9	89.9	92.3

[a] These combined percentages exceed 100 because of the possibility of multiple responses to the question.

[b] Excludes 24 current students and 1955 alumni members who did not provide this information.

percent for alumni members. Although 11.9 percent of the total group considered membership in Phi Theta Kappa of little importance, only 3.7 percent of the current students were of this opinion. Virtually none of the groups considered membership to be detrimental or of no importance. Table 41 presents these responses.

TABLE 41

IMPORTANCE OF MEMBERSHIP IN PHI THETA KAPPA TO CURRENT AND ALUMNI MEMBERS

Ratings		Total Alumni N=2690 %	Current Students N=1382 %	Total Group N=4072[a] %
Great importance		30.4	53.0	36.9
Fairly important		50.8	42.8	49.2
	Totals	81.2	95.8	86.1
Little importance		16.0	3.7	11.9
No importance		2.7	0.3	1.9
Detrimental		0.0	0.2	0.1
	Totals	18.7	4.2	13.9

[a] Excludes 31 current students and 68 alumni who did not provide this information.

Evaluation of Phi Theta Kappa Activities

These alumni and current honor students were requested to rate the activities of Phi Theta Kappa. The proportion responding to some of the items relating to this evaluation was not high. Percentages reported in the tables are based on the responses. The results appear in Table 42. Slightly less than one-fourth (24.7 percent) of the total group rated the activities as very helpful and interesting. Another 40.6 percent rated them somewhat interesting and helpful. However, the current group gave the activities a much

TABLE 42

EVALUATION OF THE ACTIVITIES OF LOCAL CHAPTERS OF PHI THETA KAPPA BY CURRENT AND ALUMNI MEMBERS

Evaluation	Total Alumni N=2697 %	Current Students N=1340 %	Total Group N=4037[a] %
Very interesting and helpful	21.6	31.0	24.7
Somewhat interesting and helpful	36.8	48.2	40.6
Totals	58.4	79.2	65.3
Uninteresting and of little value	3.5	3.2	3.4
Boring and of no value	0.5	0.2	0.4
Too few to rate	37.6	17.4	30.8

[a] Excludes 73 current students and 61 alumni members who did not supply this information.

more favorable rating than did the alumni group. Possibly this is a reflection of the effect of time. Further indication of this is the fact that 37.6 percent of the alumni group said their activities were too few to rate compared to 17.4 percent of the current student group. However, these differences may also reflect recent improvement in the quality of the fraternity's activities.

These alumni and current honor students were asked to specify the Phi Theta Kappa activity that was most rewarding and the activity that was least rewarding to them. The results for those who provided this information are presented in Tables 43 and 44.

Over two-thirds (68.1 percent) of those who identified a "most rewarding" experience specified a project or program.

TABLE 43

RATING OF MOST REWARDING ACTIVITIES OF PHI THETA KAPPA BY CURRENT AND ALUMNI MEMBERS

Activity	Total Alumni N=989	Current Students N=759	Total Group N=1748[a]
	%	%	%
Programs or projects	74.4	59.2	68.1
Academic encouragement	5.8	18.7	11.5
Building honor and pride	10.0	7.2	8.8
Socials, meeting people	6.6	4.7	5.8
Service projects	1.0	3.7	2.2
Tutoring	0.7	3.2	1.7
Other	1.4	2.3	1.8

[a] It will be noted that a small proportion of the total group responded to this item.

Substantially more alumni than current students identified "programs and projects" as the most rewarding activity. This may well be because many current students had not held membership long enough to have participated in programs and projects. The second highest area of rewarding activities

(11.5 percent) was in academic achievement and intellectual stimulation with the current student group making this choice over three times more frequently (18.7 percent) than did the alumni group (5.8 percent). None of the other areas into which the responses were classified represented more than 10 percent of the group.

Table 44 shows that relatively few of the total group (11.6 percent) identified activities as "least rewarding." Of those who did make such a response, over nine-tenths (90.3 percent) listed a particular project or a meeting. Conversely, meetings were judged as the least rewarding activity by a much higher proportion of the alumni group (52.9 percent) than of the current students (30.6 percent). Social activities were considered least rewarding by 9.7 percent of the total group responding.

TABLE 44

RATING OF LEAST REWARDING ACTIVITIES OF PHI THETA KAPPA BY CURRENT AND ALUMNI MEMBERS

	Total Alumni N=193	Current Students N=314	Total Group N=507[a]
	%	%	%
Particular project	38.3	59.2	51.2
Meetings	52.9	30.6	39.1
Social activities	8.8	10.2	9.7

[a] It will be noted that a small proportion of the total group responded to this item.

Improving Phi Theta Kappa

Most of the current and alumni Phi Theta Kappa members who were included in this study expressed satisfaction with the overall operation of the fraternity. However, nearly 50 percent recommended that greater emphasis be placed upon cultural and intellectual activities. Almost one-fourth of those who responded suggested that there be more encouragement of pride in the organization with higher standards and more publicity about the fraternity and what it is doing. Approximately one-tenth thought that there should be better local and national organization. Five and eight-tenths percent (5.8 percent) of the alumni suggested alumni meetings. In Table 45 this information is shown.

Phi Theta Kappa Conventions

Evaluations were requested of state, regional, and national conventions which had been attended. Since a relatively few members had attended these conventions, the percentages which appear in Tables 46 and 47 are based on small numbers. Those who attended, with few exceptions, considered these meetings to be interesting and helpful. The fact that 71.3 percent of the current members who attended state or regional conventions and 70.1 percent of those who attended national conventions judged them to be very interesting and helpful indicates that the quality of recent conventions is very good. Almost none of these former honor students who

TABLE 45

SUGGESTIONS BY CURRENT AND ALUMNI MEMBERS FOR IMPROVING PHI THETA KAPPA

Suggestions	Total Alumni N=943	Current Students N=793	Total Group N=1736[a]
	%	%	%
More cultural and intellectual activities	51.3	48.0	49.8
More pride, publicity, higher standards	21.8	13.4	18.0
Better organization, local and national	8.0	14.6	11.0
Better membership participation	9.4	16.6	11.0
Better advisors	3.7	2.0	2.9
Alumni meetings	5.8	0.1	2.8

[a] It will be noted that a small proportion of the total group responded to this item.

attended Phi Theta Kappa conventions evaluated them adversely.

Summary

Alumni and current members of Phi Theta Kappa consider that the honor fraternity is carrying out its purpose of recognizing and encouraging scholarship among junior college honor students. Its greatest contribution, in their judgment, is in its encouragement of high academic standards and providing a sense of accomplishment. They strongly

TABLE 46

EVALUATION OF THE STATE AND REGIONAL CONVENTIONS BY CURRENT AND ALUMNI MEMBERS

Evaluation	Total Alumni N=56 %	Current Students N=129 %	Total Group N=185[a] %
Very interesting and helpful	43.4	71.3	62.0
Somewhat interesting and helpful	37.5	17.8	24.9
Moderately interesting and helpful	19.1	7.7	11.5
Uninteresting and of little value	0.0	0.8	0.5
Boring and of no value	0.0	2.3	0.9

[a] It will be noted that a small proportion of the total group responded to this item.

recommend membership in Phi Theta Kappa to other capable junior college students.

These alumni and current members judged the activities of Phi Theta Kappa to be basically interesting and helpful. However, it was felt by a considerable number of the group that some chapters have too few worthwhile activities. Particular meetings and projects were considered the least rewarding of the activities of Phi Theta Kappa.

For the improvement of Phi Theta Kappa, most of the honor students recommend more activities that are related to

TABLE 47

EVALUATION OF THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF PHI THETA KAPPA BY CURRENT AND ALUMNI MEMBERS

Evaluation	Total Alumni N=273 %	Current Students N=77 %	Total Group N=350[a] %
Very interesting and helpful	66.2	70.1	67.0
Somewhat interesting and helpful	23.2	19.5	22.4
Moderately interesting and helpful	9.2	10.4	9.4
Uninteresting and of little value	1.5	0.0	1.2
Boring and of no value	0.0	0.0	0.0

[a] It will be noted that a small proportion of the total group responded to this item.

cultural and intellectual improvement. With few exceptions, those who attended state, regional, and national conventions of Phi Theta Kappa considered them to be interesting and helpful.

CHAPTER V

ACTIVITIES OF HONOR STUDENTS AFTER COLLEGE

Information presented in Chapter III shows that honor students assume leadership roles while in college. This chapter presents information on their graduate and professional study, their careers after college, and their performance of community responsibilities as adults.

Educational Advancement

A very high proportion of junior college honor students continue their education at senior colleges. Tables 19 and 20, which appear in Chapter III, show that 90.6 percent of the male junior college honor students transferred to senior college and that 97.6 percent of that number were graduated from the senior institution. Approximately two-thirds of the women (68.3 percent) transferred to the senior colleges and that 90.3 percent of their number were graduated. Table 19 shows that 17.3 percent of the total group acquired at least a master's degree; 1.8 percent obtained a professional degree; and 3.0 percent finished a doctoral program. That table also shows that a substantially greater percentage of men than women junior college honor students obtained advanced degrees, especially professional and doctoral degrees.

It can be seen from Table 48 that the undergraduate majors of these alumni were distributed among broad fields in the following order: (1) mathematics, science, and engineering, 28.6 percent; (2) humanities, 22.9 percent; (3) education, 15.7 percent; (4) social science, 12.9 percent; (5) business, 12.7 percent; and (6) other professional majors, 7.2 percent.

Majors of men were concentrated to an atypically high degree in mathematics, science, and engineering (54.7 percent for public institutions and 28.8 percent for private institutions). Engineering stands out as the single most popular major of the men (152) followed by mathematics (65), chemistry (48), and history (47). These figures combine the public and private junior college groups presented in Table 48. It will be noted from Table 48 that a much higher proportion of the men who attended public junior college than those who attended private institutions majored in the areas of mathematics-science-engineering. Very possibly this high concentration in the technology-related area is a reflection that these young men of high ability from lower socio-economic strata see careers in technology-related fields as the fastest and best way to attain the high goals they have set for themselves. This concentration also suggests that male junior college honor students are strongly disposed to select the more difficult majors at senior college. It will be observed from Table 48 that the second largest concentration of undergraduate majors for the men was in business, selected by 15.7

percent of the men from public junior colleges (less than one-third of the percentage majoring in science and mathematics) and 22.0 percent from private institutions. A social science major was selected by only 12.4 percent of the men who attended public junior colleges and 22.6 percent of those from the private institutions. Relatively few of the men majored in education or professional fields such as agriculture.

By contrast, humanities and education were the highest concentration of majors for women. Approximately one-third of the women (29.4 percent for public, 36.4 percent for private) majored in the humanities and 28.6 percent from the public and 17.9 percent from the private institutions in education. Social science majors were selected by 8.3 percent of the women from public junior colleges and by 17.6 percent from the private schools. A home economics, fashions, or related major was selected by nearly one-tenth of the women (9.8 percent of public, 9.9 percent private). With respect to specific majors of women, elementary education was the most frequent (176), followed by English and literature (140), mathematics (50), and home economics (49). As with the analysis for men, these figures combine the public and private institution groups.

Table 49 summarizes graduate majors of those who completed graduate degrees. It can be seen from the table that the pattern of these majors is very similar to the

TABLE 49

GRADUATE MAJORS OF JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS[a]

Type of Major	Men				Women				Total	
	Public		Private		Public		Private			
	N=268	%	N=61	%	N=157	%	N=93	%	N=579[b]	%
Math, Science, Engineering	142	53.0	24	39.3	19	12.1	12	12.7	197	34.0
Engineering	(39)		(5)						(44)	
Mathematics	(27)		(0)		(7)		(3)		(37)	
Chemistry	(19)		(3)		(3)		(4)		(29)	
Bio-science	(12)		(2)		(6)		(3)		(23)	
Medicine	(14)		(7)		(0)		(2)		(23)	
Humanities	37	13.8	17	27.9	47	29.9	27	29.9	128	22.1
English and Literature	(7)		(0)		(27)		(13)		(47)	
Religion	(17)		(12)		(4)		(2)		(35)	
Education	31	11.6	8	13.1	49	31.2	29	31.2	117	20.2
Elementary	(2)		(0)		(18)		(4)		(24)	
Guidance and Counseling	(7)		(1)		(10)		(6)		(24)	
Social Science	30	11.2	8	13.1	22	14.0	18	19.4	78	13.5
History	(9)		(2)		(4)		(7)		(22)	

Business	93	15.7	29	22.0	65	11.0	25	7.1	212	12.7
Accounting	(40)		(12)		(2)		(2)		(56)	
Administration	(20)		(10)		(5)		(6)		(41)	
Other professional majors	22	3.7	5	3.8	58	9.8	35	9.9	120	7.2
Home Economics, Fashion, etc.	(0)		(0)		(37)		(12)		(49)	
Agriculture and Forestry	(20)		(3)		(0)		(0)		(23)	
Nursing	(0)		(0)		(12)		(8)		(20)	
Totals	591	100.0	132	100.0	590	100.0	352	100.0	1665	100.0

---

[a] Only majors identified by 20 or more respondents are listed here. A more detailed breakdown appears in Appendix J.

[b] This number is smaller than the total who received undergraduate degrees shown in Table 19. This difference is due to the fact that this information was not originally taken from the questionnaire and was not available from some junior colleges at the later date when it was collected.

TABLE 48

UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS OF JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS[a]

Type of Major	Men				Women				Total	
	Public		Private		Public		Private			
	N=591	%	N=132	%	N=590	%	N=352	%[b]	N=1665	%
Math, Science, Engineering	323	54.7	38	28.8	76	12.9	39	11.1	476	28.6
Engineering	(140)		(12)		(0)		(0)		(152)	
Mathematics	(62)		(3)		(38)		(12)		(115)	
Chemistry	(39)		(9)		(14)		(8)		(70)	
Bio-science	(26)		(5)		(15)		(13)		(59)	
Pharmacy	(14)		(3)		(2)		(1)			
Humanities	58	9.8	22	16.7	173	29.4	128	36.4	381	22.9
English and Literature	(18)		(10)		(89)		(51)		(168)	
Music	(8)		(1)		(24)		(22)		(55)	
Foreign language	(6)		(1)		(16)		(16)		(39)	
Journalism	(7)		(2)		(14)		(6)		(29)	
Art	(2)		(1)		(11)		(12)		(26)	
Speech, drama	(5)		(1)		(10)		(9)		(25)	
Education	22	3.7	8	6.1	169	28.6	63	17.9	262	15.7
Elementary	(4)		(0)		(134)		(42)		(180)	
Social Science	73	12.4	30	22.6	49	8.3	62	17.6	214	12.9
History	(31)		(16)		(14)		(26)		(86)	
Sociology	(1)		(2)		(12)		(18)		(33)	
Psychology	(9)		(1)		(9)		(10)		(29)	
Political Science	(11)		(4)		(7)		(5)		(27)	

Business	20	7.5	3	4.9	9	4.7	1	1.1	33	5.7
Other professional majors	8	3.0	1	1.7	11	7.0	6	6.5	26	4.5

---

[a] Only majors identified by 20 or more respondents are listed here. A more detailed breakdown appears in Appendix K.

[b] This information is based on the 1665 whose undergraduate majors are represented in Table 48.

distribution of undergraduate majors shown in Table 48. The trend for men to major in the areas of mathematics, science, and engineering at the graduate level was even more pronounced than for the undergraduate level being 53.0 percent and 39.3 percent respectively for honor students who had attended public and private junior colleges. The specific majors selected most frequently by men was engineering (44) followed by mathematics (27) and chemistry (22). No other major area approached this concentration, the next highest being humanities with 13.8 percent for the public junior college group and 27.9 percent for the private junior college group.

For women the percentage differences between the undergraduate and graduate majors were very slight. The highest interest continued to be humanities and education, both selected by approximately one-third of the public junior college group (29.9 percent and 31.2 percent) and one-fifth of the private junior college group (22.1 percent and 20.2 percent). The highest concentration of women in a specific major was 40 in English and literature.

Occupations Following Graduation

An analysis was made of the occupations of these honor students following graduation. The total group used in the analysis included not only those students who had graduated from senior institutions but also those who had not. Due to the fact that this information was not originally obtained from the questionnaire and was not available from some junior colleges at the later date at which it was collected, the number of respondents included for this analysis was 2216 rather than the total alumni group of 2758. The present or most recent occupation was used in the analysis and is shown in Table 50.

As can be seen from Table 50, the occupations of these honor students were distributed as follows: (1) education, 28.9 percent; (2) business, 26.3 percent; (3) technology-related, 10.5 percent; (4) social service, 7.7 percent; (5) medical related, 6.3 percent; and (6) other, 6.9 percent. Another 6.7 percent were full-time students and 6.7 percent were housewives who had never been employed.

Analyzed separately for men and women, the highest concentration of occupations for men who attended junior colleges was in technology-related areas (25.8 percent), while for the men from private junior colleges the highest concentration was in business (32.7 percent) with technology related being second (18.7 percent). The next highest concentration for men from public junior colleges was in education (17.9 percent), followed by business (15.5 percent) and social service (11.5 percent). Almost as many men from public institutions were full-time students (15.1 percent) as were employed in business. With respect to specific occupations of men, engineering stands out as the single most often reported occupation (132), followed by teaching at the secondary level

(88), accounting (55), military (47), and college teaching (44).

Nearly three-fourths of the women who were employed had entered education (41.5 percent for the public junior college group and 25.5 percent for the private junior college group) and business--primarily secretarial--(31.1 percent for the public institutions and 30.8 percent for the private institutions). Only small percentages of the women chose medically related occupations (4.8 percent-public; 9.7 percent-private), social service related (4.0 percent-public; 6.7 percent-private), or technology-related (2.6 percent-public; 1.9 percent-private). Only 8.8 percent of the women who attended public junior colleges and 13.1 percent of those who attended private junior colleges reported that they had never been employed outside of the home. With respect to specific occupations of women, secretarial work was the most frequent (389), followed by teaching on the secondary level (225) and teaching on the elementary level (207).

Political, Civic and Community Activities

Information was solicited concerning the political, civic, and community activities of alumni members who were twenty-five years of age or older. For that reason, the numbers represented in Tables 51 through 57 are less than for previous tables representing the alumni group.

TABLE 50

MOST RECENT OCCUPATIONS OF FORMER JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS[a]

Type of Occupation	Men				Women				Total	
	Public		Private		Public		Private			
	N=686	%	N=150	%	N=836	%	N=580	%	N=2252	%
Education	123	17.9	26	17.3	335	41.5	145	25.5	652	28.9
Secondary teaching	(72)		(16)		(156)		(69)		(313)	
Elementary teaching	(6)		(1)		(158)		(54)		(214)	
College teaching (includes junior college)	(38)		(6)		(23)		(15)		(82)	
Private teaching	(1)		(1)		(17)		(8)		(27)	
Business	106	15.5	49	32.7	266	31.1	179	30.8	593	26.3
Secretary	(4)		(3)		(277)		(162)		(396)	
Accountant	(38)		(17)		(10)		(0)		(65)	
Manager	(17)		(7)		(3)		(8)		(35)	
Public relations and advertising	(5)		(3)		(7)		(11)		(26)	
Salesman	(11)		(10)		(0)		(2)		(23)	
Laywer	(15)		(4)		(0)		(2)		(21)	
Social Service	79	11.5	23	15.3	34	4.0	39	6.7	175	7.7
Military	(42)		(5)		(2)		(0)		(49)	
Social work	(2)		(2)		(15)		(20)		(39)	
Clergy	(13)		(13)		(4)		(7)		(37)	

Technology related	177	25.8	28	18.7	22	2.6	11	1.9	238	10.5
Engineer	(118)		(14)		(1)		(3)		(136)	
Research	(33)		(10)		(9)		(5)		(57)	
Statistics-computer	(12)		(2)		(5)		(3)		(22)	
Medical related	40	5.8	9	6.0	41	4.8	55	9.7	145	6.3
Medical Technician or aide	(0)		(0)		(18)		(14)		(59)	
Nursing	(0)		(0)		(19)		(10)		(29)	
Physician, dentist, or veterinarian	(25)		(5)		(0)		(1)		(31)	
Other	57	8.2	4	2.6	42	4.9	57	9.5	160	6.9
Journalism	(7)		(1)		(13)		(15)		(36)	
Librarian	(4)		(1)		(13)		(8)		(25)	
Full-time student	104	15.1	11	7.3	21	2.5	15	2.6	151	6.7
Housewife[c]					75	8.8	76	13.1	151	6.7

---

[a] Only occupations identified by 20 or more respondents are listed here. A more detailed breakdown appears in Appendix L. Included are the most recent occupations for women who are no longer employed.

[b] This number is smaller than the total alumni population reported in Table 3. This difference is due to the fact that this information was not originally taken from the questionnaire and was not available from some junior colleges at the later date when it was collected.

[c] Married women who were never employed.

TABLE 51

VOTING RECORD OF FORMER JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS

Voting Record	Men N=840 %	Women N=1248 %	Total N=2089[a] %
Every election	34.0	33.6	33.8
Most elections	43.6	48.9	46.8
About half of elections	8.1	5.5	6.5
Only a few elections	9.4	7.2	8.1
No elections	5.0	4.7	4.8

[a] Number of alumni members 25 years old or older.

TABLE 52

PARTICIPATION OF FORMER JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES AS INDICATED BY POLITICAL EFFORTS

Political Participation	Men N=840 %[a]	Women N=1249 %[a]	Total N=2089 %[a]
Held public office	2.1	0.9	1.4
Ran for office	1.1	0.6	0.8
Helped with campaign	20.2	19.8	20.0
Worked for a cause	34.8	28.7	31.2
None of these	61.6	66.6	64.6

[a] These combined percentages exceed 100 because of more than one response to some items.

Most of the junior college honor students report that they have a reasonably good voting record. As can be noted from Table 51, slightly over one-third of them (33.8 percent) stated that they vote in every election and another 46.8 percent stated that they vote in most elections. Less than one-fifth reported that they vote in half or less of the elections. Women reported a slightly better voting record than men.

Further indication of their interest and activity in political affairs is evidenced by the frequency with which they reported being directly involved in political races (Table 52). Over one-third reported that they had (a) held public office, (b) run for office, (c) helped with a campaign, and/or (d) worked for a political cause in which they were interested. It will be observed from Table 52 that men reported being somewhat more involved in these respects than are women.

Most of these former junior college honor students reported that they are active in community and organizational projects and activities (Table 53). This interest is reflected in the fact that onver one-third (34.3 percent) reported that they have held membership in one or more civic organizations, and another 17.0 percent reported that they have frequently helped a civic organization in which they did not hold membership. Also, 6.9 percent have helped a civic organization at least once, but 41.7 percent have not participated in any civic organization in any significant way. Men and women are about equal in their reported participation in civic affairs.

TABLE 53

PARTICIPATION BY FORMER JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS IN CIVIC AFFAIRS

Civic Participation	Men N=787	Women N=1138	Total N=2089
	%	%	%
Held membership	35.1	33.8	34.3
Helped an organization or organizations a number of times	17.8	16.4	17.0
Helped a group once	5.1	8.2	6.9
No participation reported	42.0	41.5	41.7

A substantial proportion of the group indicated that they are active in religious affairs. Table 54 shows that over two-fifths (45.1 percent) reported that they work as a church teacher or official. Another 8.0 percent stated that they work regularly for their church in a capacity other than as a teacher or office holder. Women reported being only slightly more active in religious activities than men.

The junior college honor students evidence a modest degree of interest in educational matters (Table 55). Forty-three percent stated that they attend education meetings

TABLE 55

PARTICIPATION BY FORMER JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS IN EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Activities	Men N=747 %	Women N=1086 %	Total N=1833 %
Active interest, held office	17.6	16.3	16.8
Active interest, but no office	27.5	25.3	26.2
Attended meetings regularly	15.8	21.3	19.1
Attended meetings occasionally	8.9	8.2	8.5
No activity reported	30.2	28.9	29.4

regularly and are active participants in the meetings, and 16.8 percent reported that they have held offices in educational organizations. How many of these were active because of occupational requirement is not known. By contrast, 19.1 percent stated that they attend a few educational meetings, 9.5 percent reported that they attend only occasionally, and 29.4 percent reported that they have not attended any meetings of an educational organization. The fact that a substantial proportion of the group probably do not have children of school age may account for the rather large proportion who reported no activity in educational organizations. Men and women are nearly equal in their reported interest and activity in this area.

An effort was made to ascertain the self-perceptions which these former honor students have of their interest and activity in community affairs. Table 56 shows that 64.6 percent rate themselves from very active to moderately active in community affairs. Only 5.1 percent consider themselves to be inactive. Differences between men and women in their self-perceptions were nominal.

TABLE 56

RATINGS BY FORMER JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS OF PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

Rating	Men N=730	Women N=1054	Total N=1784
	%	%	%
Very active	7.5	6.8	7.1
Fairly active	23.0	19.3	20.8
Moderately active	32.2	39.4	36.5
Little activity	32.3	29.4	30.5
No activity reported	5.0	5.1	5.1

This group was asked to indicate the number of professional and business organizations in which they hold membership. The results are presented in Table 57. Very few (5.5 percent) indicated no membership in such organizations. Nearly 95 percent (94.5 percent) reported that they hold membership in one or more professional or business organization. Men and women are about equal in the number of

TABLE 57

NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL AND BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH FORMER JUNIOR COLLEGE HONOR STUDENTS HOLD MEMBERSHIP

Number	Men N=840	Women N=1249	Total N=2089
	%	%	%
One	29.1	26.5	28.2
Two	27.1	26.4	26.8
Three	15.3	17.7	16.9
Four	9.2	14.3	11.5
Five or more	13.5	9.9	11.1
No membership reported	5.8	5.2	5.5

professional and business organizations in which they reported membership.

Summary

These junior college honor students were highly successful in advancing themselves educationally with a good proportion receiving advanced degrees. A high percentage of them, especially the men, majored in the mathematics-science related areas. Humanities and education showed the highest concentration of majors for women. The patterns of majors in graduate work was very similar to that at the undergraduate level. After graduating, two-thirds of the men were employed in technology related occupations, business or education. Engineering was the single most often reported occupation.

Nearly three-fourths of the women were employed in education or business.

A majority of these honor students reported assuming community responsibility, evidencing the same leadership that had characterized them while in college. Most of them were especially active in political, civic, and educational affairs, and in holding membership in professional and business organizations.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this investigation was to study junior college honor students who were current and alumni members of Phi Theta Kappa, the national junior college honor fraternity. Information was obtained in the following areas: (1) backgrounds prior to entering junior college, (2) activities and experiences while in junior college, (3) transfer success, (4) reactions to junior college, (5) comparisons of junior and senior college experiences, (6) activities and honors in senior college, (7) undergraduate and graduate majors, (8) professional activities following graduation, and (9) acceptance of community responsibilities.

One hundred twelve (112) chapters of Phi Theta Kappa in 30 states and the District of Columbia participated in this survey. The population consisted of 4,171 junior college honor students. This represented a sample of over 95 percent of current students and 66.4 percent of alumni members of participating institutions for the years covered by the study. The groups studied consisted of: (1) a current group in 1965, composed of 1,030 public junior college students and 383 private junior college students; and (2) three alumni groups from 1960-61, composed of 839 public and 500 private junior college honor students, from 1957-58, composed of 652 public and 361 private junior college honor students, and from 1947-48, composed of 323 public and 83 private junior college honor students.

Two questionnaires, one for current and one for alumni Phi Theta Kappa members, constituted the data gathering instruments in this study. These instruments, with instructions for administering them, were distributed to the chapters of participating institutions by the Executive Director of Phi Theta Kappa. Current student questionnaires were completed by students who were enrolled in participating junior colleges. Alumni questionnaires were sent to alumni members of participating institutions under direction of the chapter sponsors. Completed questionnaires were returned to the Executive Director who forwarded them to this investigator for analysis.

Summary of Findings

Slightly more than three-fifths (63.8 percent) of these junior college honor students were women, including 57.6 percent of those who attended public institutions. Over three-fourths (76.6 percent) were 18 years old or younger at the time of entering junior college. Less than seven percent (6.9 percent) were or had been married when they entered college.

Only 16.2 percent of those who attended public junior colleges were from homes where the head of the household's occupation was classified as professional or semi-professional. By contrast, nearly one-third (31.6 percent) of those who attended private junior colleges were from homes where the occupation of the head of the household was classified as professional or semi-professional. Over one-fourth (27.6 percent) of the mothers were employed outside the home.

Nearly two-thirds (63.1 percent) of these honor students were from homes where the head of the household had no education beyond high school and in 21.5 percent of the cases no education beyond the elementary school. Over half (54.9 percent) of these students were from families with three or more children and 13.1 percent were from families with five or more children.

Over two-fifths (45.3 percent) of the public junior college honor students ranked "nearness to home" first as their reason for attending junior college, and 29.5 percent ranked "low cost" first. By contrast, the reason most frequently ranked first by those who attended private junior colleges was "suited educational needs" (30.0 percent).

Over half of these students (57.0 percent) were employed less than 10 hours per week while attending junior college. However, 17.8 percent held part-time employment that required 20 or more hours of work per week.

A high percentage of these honor students (79.0 percent) graduated from junior college and 78.1 percent of the total group transferred to senior college. Of those who transferred 97.6 percent of the men received a baccalaureate degree compared to 90.3 percent of the women. Of those not graduating from junior colleges, over half (52.8 percent) reported that they transferred because the junior college could not satisfy their educational needs, and another 7.2 percent reported that they transferred because there were specific junior college requirements they did not wish to complete. Of those who transferred to but did not graduate from senior college, 18.3 percent of the men and 10.6 percent of the women reported that they withdrew for financial reasons. Another 10.9 percent of the men and 50.6 percent of the women reported that they withdrew to get married.

Academic honors were attained by a large proportion of these honor students (63.6 percent) after they transferred to senior institutions. In addition, 41.8 percent reported that they were active in senior college extra-curricular activities.

The counseling and guidance which these students received in junior college was judged by a majority of those who transferred to be superior to that received in senior college. Two-fifths (40.1 percent) rated the counseling and guidance which they received in junior college equal to what they received in senior college, 44.3 percent rated it superior to that of the senior college, whereas only 15.6 percent rated the senior college counseling and guidance superior.

These honor students who transferred judged the instruction which they received in junior and senior colleges to be of comparable quality. Over half (55.3 percent) rated the instruction received in junior and senior colleges as about equal, 27.0 percent rated senior college instruction superior to that of the junior college, and 17.7 percent rated the junior college instruction superior. Class work in senior college was considered to be significantly harder than that of junior colleges by 25.1 percent of the group, somewhat harder by 35.5 percent, and about the same by 33.2 percent.

Nearly three-fifths of these honor students who transferred (58.3 percent) reported that they maintained about the same grade point average in senior college that they had earned in junior college. A large majority of them (83.0 percent) stated that they experienced no delay in graduation after transferring to senior institutions. Over two-fifths (41.4 percent) were of the view that a student of high ability definitely can receive as good an education by attending a junior college as he can by attending a senior college during his first two years; another 38.2 percent felt that he probably can; and 15.1 percent felt that he possibly can.

Nearly three-fourths (73.7 percent) of these students reported that they would definitely recommend membership in Phi Theta Kappa to someone who was eligible for it, and slightly over one-fifth (22.5 percent) reported that they would probably recommend membership. Phi Theta Kappa was reported by 92.3 percent of its members to be of value to them by giving them a sense of accomplishment, and 85.9 percent reported that it was valuable in giving them encouragement toward high academic standards. Nearly half of these honor students (49.8 percent) recommended that local Phi Theta Kappa chapters include more activities relating to cultural and intellectual improvements.

An unusually high percentage of men who attended public junior colleges (54.7 percent) took undergraduate majors in the science-mathematics area. Business was the undergraduate major most frequently chosen by men who attended private junior colleges (22.0 percent). Approximately one-third of the women (29.4 percent from public schools, 36.4 from private schools) took undergraduate majors in humanities, and 28.6 percent of them from public junior colleges and 17.9 percent of them from the private junior colleges took undergraduate majors in education. Graduate majors followed closely the undergraduate pattern with an increase among men from private schools in science-mathematics majors (39.3 percent).

A high proportion of the men (31.9 percent) who received baccalaureate degrees undertook advanced study and subsequently obtained master's degrees, and another 11.8 percent ultimately obtained advanced professional or doctoral degrees. Of the women, 8.7 percent who received baccalaureate degrees obtained master's degrees and 0.8 percent received advanced professional or doctoral degrees.

After finishing their formal education, men were employed most frequently in education (28.9 percent), followed by business (26.3 percent) and technology related occupations (10.5 percent). Engineering was the single occupation pursued most frequently by men. Women from public junior colleges were employed most frequently in education (41.5 percent), followed by business (31.1 percent). Women from private junior colleges were employed most frequently in business (30.8 percent), followed by education (25.5 percent).

A majority of these honor students (64.6 percent) rated themselves from very active to moderately active in community affairs. Nearly 95 percent (94.5 percent) reported that they hold membership in one or more professional or business organizations.

Conclusions

It can be concluded from the findings of this study that public junior colleges are providing an opportunity for education beyond high school for many academically talented students who otherwise probably would be denied an opportunity for higher education. Further, it is evident that junior colleges are doing a very creditable job of preparing academically superior students to continue their education at senior colleges and universities. Moreover, junior college honor students receive academic recognition and accept leadership roles in senior colleges.

These honor students who transferred judged their junior college teaching equal to that which they received in senior college. On the other hand, they viewed their studies at the senior college as more difficult than their junior college studies.

Too, it is manifestly clear that Phi Theta Kappa is performing a significant educational service in those institutions where chapters exist. The findings of this study strongly support the view that junior colleges should seriously consider establishing Phi Theta Kappa chapters and that the Fraternity deserves the support--financial and moral--of the college administration.

The findings of this investigation indicate that men junior college honor students who transfer to senior colleges select majors in scientific studies to an unusually high degree. Further, by virtue of the high proportion of both men and women who entered education, it seems that an aggressive recruitment program would have resulted in a much higher proportion of these honor students selecting junior college teaching.

Recommendations for Further Research

The results of this study suggest several related areas that seem profitable for further research. One area that would seem to warrant investigation is whether differences in personality and/or values exist between junior college students of high ability who become members of Phi Theta Kappa and those who do not. A study should also be made which compares the subsequent academic and professional pursuits and success of the two groups.

Also recommended are parallel studies of junior college honor students and scholastically superior freshmen and sophomores in senior colleges. Areas to be covered in such a study might include: personal backgrounds, activities and honors in college, academic standing undergraduate and graduate majors, and activities following graduation.

Further investigations should be conducted concerning the reasons for men honor students taking majors in scientific studies in such high proportions. Questions such as, "Does this reflect a value system and/or is it a result of faculty guidance, or is it due to other factors" need to be explained.

Increasingly junior colleges are initiating special honors courses and programs for students with exceptional talents. Well designed research studies are needed to assess the effectiveness of such efforts.

ALUMNI QUESTIONNAIRE

Phi Theta Kappa Fraternity
National Headquarters
Canton, Mississippi

Name: ______________________ **Sex:** M____ F____ **Year of Birth** ____________

Maiden Name: ______________________

This questionnaire is a part of a nation-wide study of Phi Theta Kappa. The Phi Theta Kappa fraternity is now forty-eight years old, and the two-hundred and seventy chapters that make up this organization have undertaken a study of themselves. You are a part of this elite family and your answers to the following questions will help us to present an accurate picture of Phi Theta Kappa and its membership. Your cooperation in answering the questions accurately and completely will be of utmost importance to the success of this study. You may be sure that your answers to the questions will be kept in strict confidence and will be used only for the purpose of this study.

Return this completed questionnaire to your local chapter of Phi Theta Kappa, using the self-addressed stamped envelope which is enclosed for that purpose.

---

1. **In the space provided below, list all the colleges and/or universities you attended, including the junior college.**

	Name of Institution	Dates of Attendance	Major pursued	Type of Degree Received
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				

2. **List the activities you have engaged in since leaving college.**

	Period (In years)	Type of Activity (Military service, high school teacher, housewife, etc.)	Employer
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

In each question, place the number or numbers you have selected in the blank on the left.

______ 3. **At the time I entered junior college, my marital status was:**

1. Single
2. Married
3. Divorced or Separated
4. Widowed

______ 4. **The following are typical reasons that students give for entering a junior college. All of the answers may not apply, but rank in order of importance those which do, your first answer being the most important, your second answer being the next most important, etc.**

______

______

______

______

______

______

1. It was near and I could live at home while attending college.
2. Low cost.
3. Another member of the family had previously attended a junior college.
4. I wanted to see if I could do college work.
5. I thought that a junior college was best suited to my educational needs.
6. I wanted only a two-year program.
7. I could not get into the school of first choice.
8. Other (specify) ______________________.

______ 5. **The occupational classification of the head of my family at the time I entered junior college was: (select the most suitable classification)**

1. Professional and semi-professional worker. (Lawyers, teachers, doctors, writers, artists, business executive, graduate engineers, research workers, etc.)
2. Proprietors, managers, and officials. (Postmasters, manufacturers, retailers, bankers, automobile sales and service, hotel keepers, accountants, etc.)
3. Craftsman, foreman, and kindred workers. (Carpenters, cabinet makers, pattern workers, masons, plumbers, mechanics, etc.)
4. Operative and kindred workers. (Mine operators, chauffeurs, truck and bus drivers, attendants-filling stations, parking lots, welders, farm laborers, farm foreman, lumberman, etc.)
5. Clerical, sales and kindred workers. (Bookkeepers, baggage man, cashiers, stenographers, typists, secretaries, telephone and telegraph operators, mail carriers, insurance agents, etc.)
6. Protective service workers. (Firemen, policemen, sheriffs, detectives, guards and watchmen, soldiers, sailors, marines, etc.)
7. Service workers except domestic and protective. (Barbers, beauticians, boardinghouse keepers, housekeepers, cooks except for private families, bartenders, waiters, etc.)
8. Farmers and farm managers. (Farm owners living on farms, renters of farms, etc.)
9. Domestic service workers. (Servants and laundresses—private family housekeepers, domestic service workers.)
10. Unemployed persons and pensioners. Persons now working because no jobs are available and persons living on pensions.

6. **The occupational status of my mother at the time I entered junior college was:**

______ (a) If your mother (foster or step-mother) was the head of your family check the space preceding "a."

______ (b) If your mother (foster or step-mother) was not employed outside of the home, check the space preceding "b."

______ (c) If your mother (foster or step-mother) was employed outside of the home but was not the head of the household, enter the number in the space preceding "c" that gives her occupation by using the classifications given for Item 5.

______ 7. **The educational attainments of the head of my family at the time I entered junior college was:**

1. Eighth grade or less.
2. Some high school but did not graduate.
3. High school graduate but did not continue formal education further.
4. Entered but did not complete a college program.
5. Finished a two-year program.
6. Graduate from a senior college but did not continue further.
7. Graduate or professional study but no degree beyond the Bachelor's.
8. Obtained a graduate or professional degree.

______ 8. **The educational attainments of my mother (foster or step-mother) at the time I entered junior college was: (use the items in No. 7; omit if your mother was also head of the family).**

______ 9. **The number of brothers and sisters that I had at the time I entered junior college was:**

0. None
1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four
5. More (give the exact number)

_____ **10. While junior college was in session, I was employed for pay (including at the college or in my parents' business) approximately:**
1. None.
2. Less than 10 hours per week.
3. 10 to 19 hours per week.
4. 20 to 29 hours per week.
5. 30 or more hours per week.

_____ **11. If you were starting to college again would you enroll in a junior college?**
1. Definitely I would enroll in a junior college.
2. Probably I would.
3. Possibly I would.
4. Definitely I would not.

_____ **12. Which of the following most closely approximates the amount of work which you completed in a junior college?**
1. Less than 30 semester or 45 quarter hours.
2. 30 to 45 semester or 45 to 60 quarter hours.
3. Over 45 semester or 60 quarter hours but did not receive a junior college degree.
4. Received a junior college degree.

_____ **13. The primary reason I did not complete junior college was: (answer only if the question is appropriate)**
1. Transferred to another college.
2. Lack of financial resources.
3. Wanted to go to work.
4. Personal illness.
5. Lack of interest in continuing in college.
6. Entered into military service.
7. Entered a specialized training program.
8. Parents encouraged me to withdraw.
9. Marriage.

Answer questions 14 through 32 only if you transferred to a senior college. Otherwise continue with question 33.

14. The name of the senior college or university to which I transferred is _____________________

____

Did you graduate? _____________________.

If yes, name your major. _____________________

_____ **15. (Answer only if applicable) I transferred from the junior college before graduating because:**
1. The work at the junior college seemed to be sub-standard.
2. The junior college could not satisfy my educational needs as well as the senior college.
3. The extra-curricular activities of the junior college were too limited.
4. There was a greater amount of prestige in the senior college.
5. Wanted to get away from my home environment.
6. There were specific junior college requirements that I did not want to complete.
7. Other. (specify) _____________________

_____ **16. (Answer only if you transferred before graduating from junior college.) If faced again with the decision of transferring to a senior college before graduating from junior college, I:**
1. Definitely would.
2. Probably would.
3. Possibly would.
4. Probably would not.
5. Definitely would not.

_____ **17. (Answer only if applicable) After transferring to a senior college, I did not graduate from the senior college because:**
1. I found the work too difficult.
2. I was not interested in continuing in formal education.
3. Lack of financial resources.
4. Had to withdraw for family reasons.
5. Entered military service.
6. Married.
7. Other (specify) _____________________

_____ **18. In the senior college I received the honor (s) of: (List as many as are appropriate in your case)**

_____

_____

_____

1. Becoming a member of Phi Beta Kappa or other general scholastic honorary.
2. Becoming a member of a specific academic honorary organization such as science, history, etc.
3. Being awarded a scholastic or academic scholarship.
4. Other (specify) _____________________
5. None–did not receive any of these honors.

_____ **19. In the senior college I was elected an officer of: (List as many as are appropriate in your case)**

_____

_____

_____

1. The student government.
2. One of the classes.
3. One of the on-campus clubs.
4. One of the athletic organizations.
5. Other (specify) _____________________
6. None–did not serve in any of these capacities of leadership.

_____ **20. In the senior college the extra-curricular activities that I engaged in included: (List as many as are appropriate in your case)**

_____

_____

_____

1. Being a member of the newspaper staff.
2. Being a member of the yearbook staff.
3. Participating in student club work.
4. Other (specify) _____________________
5. None–did not become active in any of these things.

______21. **The counseling and guidance I received on the senior college level either by trained counselors or faculty advisees was:**
1. Inadequate.
2. Adequate.
3. Good.
4. Excellent.

______22. **The counseling and guidance I received on the junior college level either by trained counselors or faculty advisees was:**
1. Inadequate.
2. Adequate.
3. Good.
4. Excellent.

______23. **The counseling and guidance I received on the junior college level either by trained counselors or faculty advisees was:**
1. Much poorer than what I received on the senior college level.
2. Somewhat poorer than what I received on the senior college level.
3. Equal to what I received on the senior college level.
4. Somewhat better than what I received on the senior college level.
5. Definitely superior to what I received on the senior college level.

______24. **Overall, the quality of teaching that I received in the junior college was:**
1. Significantly poorer than what I received in the senior college.
2. Somewhat poorer than what I received in the senior college.
3. About the same as what I received in the senior college.
4. Somewhat better than what I received in the senior college.
5. Significantly better than what I received in the senior college.

Items 25, 26, and 27 are included to obtain information for a subsequent study. Your cooperation is requested.

25. **The name of the best teacher that I had in the junior college was:______________**
(Give as much of the name as you remember.)
The field or area of instruction was:________
____

26. **The name of the best teacher I had in the senior college was:______________**
(Give as much of the name as you remember.)
The field or area of instruction was:________
____

27. **Of these two teachers, the better one was:**
____

______28. **Overall, the better instruction was at the:**
1. Junior college.
2. Senior college.

______29. **The class work (length of assignments, course requirements, etc.) in the senior college was:**
1. Significantly harder than in the junior college.
2. Somewhat harder than in the junior college.
3. About the same as in the junior college.
4. Somewhat easier than in the junior college.
5. Significantly easier than in the junior college.

______30. **My overall grade average the first year after transferring to senior college:**
1. Dropped considerably (one letter grade or more) below what it was in the junior college.
2. Dropped somewhat below what it was in the junior college.
3. Dropped at first, but then improved to equal or better than it was in junior college.
4. Remained about the same as in the junior college.
5. Increased somewhat over my junior college average.
6. Increased considerably (one letter grade or better) over my junior college average.

______31. **Going to the junior college delayed my graduation from a senior college:**
1. None at all.
2. By a summer term.
3. By a quarter.
4. By a semester.
5. By a year or more.

______32. **Did your membership in Phi Theta Kappa help you to obtain financial aid to attend a senior college?**
1. Yes.
2. No.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

______33. **It is my opinion that, in general, a student of high ability can obtain as good an education in a junior college as he can by attending a senior college his first two years.**
1. Definitely he can not.
2. Probably he can not.
3. Possibly he can.
4. Probably he can.
5. Definitely he can.

______ **34. Have you sent or do you plan to send your own children to a junior college?**
1. Definitely not.
2. Probably not.
3. Possibly not.
4. Probably I would.
5. Definitely I would.

______ **35. To someone eligible for Phi Theta Kappa membership, I would:**
1. Definitely not recommend it.
2. Probably not recommend it.
3. Possibly not recommend it.
4. Probably recommend it.
5. Definitely recommend it.

______ **36. Phi Theta Kappa was of significant value to me: (Rank, in order of importance, as many of these answers as you think are significant.)**
1. Mentally because it encouraged me toward high academic standards.
2. Socially because it helped me to make new friends.
3. Educationally because it helped me in all phases of my education.
4. Personally because it helped me develop in leadership.
5. Personally because of the satisfaction of having done something well.
6. Other (specify)______

______ **37. In general, I found the activities of Phi Theta Kappa to be:**
1. Very interesting and helpful.
2. Somewhat interesting and helpful.
3. Uninteresting and of little value.
4. Boring and of no value at all.
5. So few that I do not remember them or can not rate them.

______ **38. (Answer only if you have personally attended the national convention) I found the National Convention of Phi Theta Kappa to be:**
1. Very interesting and helpful.
2. Somewhat interesting and helpful.
3. Moderately interesting and helpful.
4. Uninteresting and of little value.
5. Boring and of no value.

______ **39. (Answer only if you have personally attended the state or regional meeting) I found the Regional and/or State Conventions of Phi Theta Kappa to be:**
1. Very interesting and helpful.
2. Somewhat interesting and helpful.
3. Moderately interesting and helpful.
4. Uninteresting and of little value.
5. Boring and of no value.

40. The Phi Theta Kappa activity which was most rewarding to me was:______

41. The Phi Theta Kappa activity which was least rewarding to me was:______

______ **42. Phi Theta Kappa has helped me: (Rank, in order of importance, as many of these answers as you think are significant.)**
1. Find and make new friends.
2. By giving me scholastic opportunities and encouragement.
3. To find a better employment than I otherwise might have obtained.
4. To be associated with intellectually stimulating people.
5. To have an increased interest in educational matters.
6. To have a feeling of scholarly attainment.
7. Other (specify)______.

43. Phi Theta Kappa could, in my opinion, most be improved by:______

______ **44. The importance placed on Phi Theta Kappa membership by me personally could best be described as:**
1. Of great importance.
2. Fairly important.
3. Of little importance to me.
4. Of no importance.
5. Detrimental.

Answer questions 45 through 50 only if you are age 25 or older.

______ **45. I have voted in:**
1. Every election open to me.
2. Most of the elections open to me.
3. About half of the elections open to me.
4. Only a few of the elections open to me.
5. None of the elections open to me.

______ **46. I have been interested in political affairs and I have:**
1. Held a public office for a time.
2. Run for at least one political office.
3. Helped with the campaign of at least one candidate for public office.
4. Worked for some political cause that I was interested in.

______ **47. I have been interested in civic affairs and I:**
1. Have held membership in one or more civic organizations.
2. Have frequently helped some civic organization(s), but I was not a member of any.

3. Once helped one of the organizations in a project.
4. Have not participated with them in any significant way.

____**48. I have been interested in religious affairs,**
1. And I have worked regularly for my religious organization, even to being a teacher for it or holding an office with the group.
2. And I have worked regularly for my religious organization, but I have not been a teacher or held an office with the group.
3. And I have attended the meetings of my religious organization regularly.
4. And I have occasionally attended the meetings of my religious organization.
5. But I have not done anything for a religious organization.

____**49. I have been interested in the educational activities in my area,**
1. And I have taken an active part in educational meetings, even to holding office in an educational organization.
2. And I have taken an active part in educational meetings, but I have not held any offices in the organization.
3. And I have attended a few educational meetings.
4. But I have attended only one or two educational meetings.
5. But I have not attended any meetings of any educational organization.

____**50. In my overall interest and activity in religious, civic, social, political, and educational activities, I rank myself as:**
1. Very active in most of the items listed.
2. Fairly active in most of the items listed.
3. Moderately active in most of the items listed.
4. Very little participation in the items listed.
5. No activity in the items listed.

51. Of what professional or business organizations are you a member?
1. ________________________
2. ________________________
3. ________________________
4. ________________________
5. ________________________
6. ________________________
7. ________________________